The Church of the Middle Ages

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

BR 162.2 .V64 1970 c.2
Volz, Carl A.
The church of the Middle
Ages

CHURCH IN HISTORY SERIES

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 12 1971
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES

Growth and Change from 600 to 1400

BY CARL A. VOLZ

Concordia Publishing House
Saint Louis ● London

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Missouri
Concordia Publishing House Ltd., London, E. C. 1
Copyright © 1970 Concordia Publishing House
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 72-99217

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dedicated to my parents
Rev. and Mrs. Oswald S. Volz

FOREWORD

The period of approximately 1,000 years between the 6th and 16th centuries is generally recognized as the Middle Ages. These were years in which a once woefully dislocated European-Roman society strove to find its new level. Out of these centuries of trial and error emerged a new society—the Christian society.

The two most involved elements were Germanic mores over against the subsoil of Roman culture which had been overrun but not destroyed by the former. The custodian, guardian, and repository as well as propagator of the Roman element was the church and its agencies, mainly Benedictinism. German law was local and tribal; ecclesiastical law, having been patterned on Roman law, was universal in its application. The conflict of the two laws met headon when the king, lord, or prince established a local church on his property and, since it was on his property, considered it his legal tribal right to appoint its priest, administer its affairs, and collect its revenues. Within this conflict at the local parish level lies the kernel of two greater conflicts: (a) the enmeshment of the church in feudal relations and the effort to untangle it therefrom as the main issue involved in the investiture contest; (b) the wider problem of church and state which grew out of the investiture contest and assumed still wider proportions with the rediscovery of Roman imperial law, which was now utilized to supply legitimacy for the nascent national state.

This is only one phase of the medieval scene and probably not the most important one at that. We are apt to forget that Europe had several kings, thousands of lords, but millions of unheard-of people. The latter kept Europe going. Theirs are the lives of importance. They are the people who constituted the bulk of the new Christian society.

When Pope Gregory I decided to use the hitherto cloistered Benedictine monk (Augustine) as an active missionary in Anglo-Saxon Britain, he set in motion the processes by means of which millions were added to this new society. The Benedictine Anglo-Saxons evangelized the Germanies, established ties with Rome, reformed the church in Gaul and gave the Carolingians their first renaissance — an ecclesiastical one which was but a prelude to its cultural one. Alcuin was a worthy son of St. Boniface.

The focal point of interest for the ordinary medieval man was the local parish church, which was apt to have a much more intimate relationship with its parishioners than the majority of our present-day churches. It was the place of worship; in it the local inhabitants were baptized, received the sacraments, were married and buried beside its walls, on the south side. It was the local club into which its young people retreated to dance in case of rain; in it were stored surplus farm products; its year was not a calendar of months; instead it was a calendar revolving around the ecclesiastical feasts and seasons. That its priest was not too well educated is true; on the other hand, because of his level of education he was more likely to reach his parishioners than would a university man trained in theological and philosophical "quips and quiddities." After all, who was it who said, "Unless you become as little children."

The production of this manuscript by the Rev. Carl Volz is of great moment to me, indeed. I have known him now over several years as a student, a maturing scholar, and a friend. Each year he has increased my pleasure by fulfilling my hopes and expectations in his particular field of study. In particular he gave great hope to me in his seminar research. With the publication of his many scholarly articles and now this book, he is coming into full maturity as a scholar. His objective interest in monasticism has won him a wide circle of friends of all faiths. But above and beyond all this, Rev. Volz is possessed of a gift, God given. As befits his vocation, he is a man of deep spiritual sensibility—the man of understanding is of a precious spirit.

Fordham University *Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan*
Advent 1969

CONTENTS

	Introduction	9
1.	The Conversion of Europe	12
2.	The Church in Feudal Society	39
3.	Teaching	65
4.	Church and State	92
5.	East and West	122
6.	Dissent and Reform	146
	Appendix: Readings from Primary Sources	169
	Suggestions for Further Reading	194
	Index	196

INTRODUCTION

For many people the term "medieval" carries with it romantic associations of a remote age characterized by knights in armor, lordly princes, and imposing castles, all supported by exploited serfs who were forced to till the rocky soil. For many contemporaries the term also has become identified with that which seems archaic, irrelevant, impractical, or even benighted.

Before embarking on a description of the church in the Middle Ages, it may be helpful to discuss some presuppositions often harbored by the average modern reader concerning this period.* First, one sometimes encounters the notion that the medieval church (and society as well) was a static, monolithic institution which remained unchanged for nearly a thousand years. The assumption is often made that people lived and thought exactly the same in 600 as in 1400. The present study will attempt to show that the church in these centuries was dynamic, ever changing, and in constant flux.

Modern man often sees the medieval church as something existing apart from the political and economic world of its time—but at the same time as an institution which possessed unlimited power and a monopoly control over men's thoughts. The role of the clergy is often stressed to the point where craftsmen, merchants, serfs, and kings were largely directed by a church which stood outside of society and manipulated it. In reality the church was inextricably

* The author is in debt to Richard E. Sullivan's Smith History Lecture of 1966, *The Medieval Church—A View from the 1960's* (Houston: University of St. Thomas, 1966), for the main themes of the analysis here given.

a part of the society in which it lived, and for centuries popes, bishops, and priests were actually dominated by princes and subject to lay control.

Another modern myth of the medieval church suggests that it devoted itself to turning men's minds away from the present world to a supernatural future life in heaven. Those who foster this view often claim that the medieval man's lot in life was so burdensome he had no choice but to take refuge in the hope of future bliss. In reality the church of this period was probably no more "future oriented" than the church of any other age.

These three presuppositions regarding the medieval church are largely the result of Renaissance humanism. That is, historians of the 16th and 17th century tended to repudiate the millennium which preceded them in order to return to the patterns of civilization of Greece and Rome. This attitude also affected some theologians, who tended to glorify the ancient church as a kind of golden age of Christianity. In order to make antiquity appear more desirable, they tended to color the Middle Ages extremely dark, so that until modern times the very term "medieval" has retained overtones of static traditionalism and unrefined barbarity which the facts of history do not bear out.

It may not be misrepresenting modern men to say that the medieval church is often interpreted according to one's religious attitude—whether Protestant, Roman Catholic, or secular humanist. The Protestant registers disapproval of the medieval church because he believes it departed from the alleged purity of the patristic age, and it was therefore necessary for a Reformation to purge the church of corruption and malpractice. In so doing he tends to cast the Reformers in a heroic stance, battling against dark and malevolent forces. The Roman Catholic may tend to look upon this period as a golden age, an "age of faith," when men revered the church and followed her unchanging laws. The secularist objects to the supposed otherworldliness of the medieval church and its authoritarianism, both of which seem to be contrary to the modern age of science and democracy. All three views: Protestant, Roman Catholic, and secularist—are based upon a kind of mythical medieval

church which actually never existed. It is a purpose of this book to present the church as it developed, with the hope that the reader will be able to assess its true nature with sympathetic understanding.

It is difficult to defend any single set of dates for the beginning and end of the Middle Ages, and historians have rarely agreed on determining its limits. This study begins A. D. 600 because by this time the West was relatively stable politically, the first wave of barbarian invaders had ceased, and Western Europe was beginning to develop its own unique culture. On the other hand, by A. D. 1400 the most distinctly medieval traits had either died or were in the process of radical change. Feudalism had already given way to capitalism, and new national states were emerging from older tribes and kingdoms. The church in the 14th century was entering a new stage of ferment which would ultimately result in the Reformation.

The book follows a topical format, although a sense of chronology has been retained in the progression of topics.

Between the years 600 and 1400 Western Christianity was concentrated in the lands bordered by the Atlantic on the west; the Vistula, Theiss, and Adriatic on the east; the Mediterranean on the south; and the Baltic on the north. At the beginning of this period, however, Christianity was largely confined to the Mediterranean basin. Chapter 1 is the story of the expansion of Christianity northward, setting the stage for the drama of the medieval church.

CHAPTER 1 •

THE CONVERSION OF EUROPE

THE SETTING

Christianity was born into a politically stable world during the time of the *Pax Romana.* For over three centuries the church developed within the confines of the Roman Empire. Although Christian missionaries occasionally crossed the boundaries of the empire to evangelize the barbarian tribes, the church in the West remained largely centered in the Mediterranean basin.

By the year 600 this situation had changed. The unity of the empire had been shattered by the influx of German tribes, who had crossed the Rhine and were in the process of establishing themselves as independent states: the Burgundians in the Rhone valley, the Visigoths in Spain and southern France, and the Vandals in north Africa. Italy had already come under the domination of the Lombards 30 years before, although the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantium) still controlled southern Italy and Sicily. All of these tribes had been converted to Arianism, a heretical form of Christianity, and when they settled among the orthodox Roman inhabitants, a religious dimension was added to the frictions which naturally arose between them.

The Franks dominated France and the Low Countries. Although they had adopted orthodox Christianity under Clovis (about 496 A. D.) it had been more in the nature of a political conversion than an espousal of the Christian faith and way of life. To the north of the Franks lived the fierce Saxon tribes who were still devotees of Teutonic nature religions. To the East, extending through modern Russia, lay the kingdom of the Slavs and Avars who likewise wor-

shiped their tribal gods. Orthodox Christianity was strongest south of the Danube and in the Eastern provinces stretching through Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt and to the borders of Persia.

The isles of Great Britain had been invaded by the Picts, Scots, and Angles during the 5th century. By the year 600 these tribes had sorted themselves out into seven small kingdoms known collectively as the Heptarchy. Although Christianity had made an appearance in Britain by the year 300, the invaders had forced the Christians to flee to western England where they maintained a separate existence.

Despite the fact that barbarian hordes had threatened the unity of the West, no one at this time considered the empire either to be divided or to have "fallen." Since 476 there had been only one emperor, and he lived in Constantinople. He was acknowledged as the supreme ruler from Britain to Persia, although this homage was often merely token. The emperor's "presence" in the West was through a representative known as the exarch, who resided in Ravenna.

GREGORY THE GREAT

Gregory, who served as bishop of Rome from 590–604, had already been a prefect (mayor) of the city at age 30. Soon thereafter he sold his possessions in order to establish six monasteries and give the remainder to charity. After living for some time in one of his monastic houses he was appointed a deacon of Rome, a job which involved dispensing food and clothing to the poor. In 578 the pope had made him the papal representative at the emperor's court in Constantinople. His experiences there convinced him that no help for Italy or the West was to be expected from this quarter, as the Eastern empire was itself engaged in a crucial struggle with Persia.

On his accession to the papacy he found Italy in an alarming state. The land was devastated by famine and pestilence, and Rome was threatened by the Lombards. Gregory himself offers us an eyewitness acount.

> Everywhere we see mourning; from all sides we hear lamentation. Cities are destroyed, military camps are overturned, fields are laid waste . . . . We see some led captive, some mutilated, others murdered . . . and she herself [Rome] who once seemed to be the mistress of the world, what has remained of her is abundantly afflicted with tremendous misfortunes! Where is the Senate? And nevertheless we, those few who remain, are daily attacked by the sword and still daily attacked by numerous woes.[1]

Owing to the failure of Byzantium to defend Rome, it was left to the pope to do what he could. He secured food to stave off famine, he saw to the needs of the sick, and he attempted to bring order into a chaotic ecclesiastical establishment. As a corporate expression of repentance before God, he directed the populace to march in procession and chant the *Kyrie eleison.* Years later the story was told that as the procession passed by Hadrian's tomb (emperor 117 to 138) they saw the archangel Michael replacing in its sheath his sword of vengeance, a sign that the plague would soon be over. A statue of Michael still stands atop the tomb today commemorating this event.

Gregory also negotiated a peace with the Lombards independently of the weak Byzantine exarch (provincial viceroy) at Ravenna, thereby establishing a precedent for papal independence of action in temporal affairs. The pope already was a considerable prince in his own right, for over the centuries the bishop of Rome had been given properties in Italy which brought considerable revenues. This property, known as the "patrimony of Peter," was used by Gregory to alleviate the suffering of the city and to strengthen its defenses. The impotence of the Eastern emperor left the pope as virtually the sole defender of order and justice in Italy.

Gregory was also concerned about the low level of education among the priests of Rome, and to equip them for their tasks he composed "A Pastoral Rule," a work which had considerable influence on the training of pastors throughout the Middle Ages. The work is a remarkable handbook of pastoral theology, including suggestions on premarital counselling, preaching, dealing with troublemakers, sick

visitations, and warnings against undignified behavior and sloth. The opening lines are still relevant today:

> No one ventures to teach any art unless he has learned it after deep thought. With what rashness, then, would the pastoral office be undertaken by the unfit, seeing that the government of souls is the art of arts! For who does not realize that the wounds of the mind are more hidden than the internal wounds of the body? . . . There are some who investigate spiritual precepts with shrewd diligence, but in the life they live trample on what they have penetrated by their understanding . . . . [The pastor] should find . . . joy not in ruling over men but in helping them . . . . When these little ones are enduring the waves of temptation, they will have recourse to the pastor's understanding as to a mother's bosom, and in the solace of his comforting words cleanse themselves when they see themselves defiled by . . . sin. . . .[2]

Gregory has been credited with establishing the Roman *schola cantorum* which introduced Gregorian chant into the liturgy. His *Moralia* is an exegetical treatment of Job filled with moral exhortations; his *Dialogues*, which reflect a belief in miracles and extraordinary events up to his time, served as a model for hagiography in subsequent ages. This work also provided the basis for the medieval teaching of purgatory and the beneficent effect of masses for the dead.

THE CONVERSION OF GREAT BRITAIN

We are fortunate to have a full account of the early English church from the Venerable Bede, who wrote during the 8th century. He reports that in 596 Gregory sent the monk Augustine with 40 companions to reconvert England. His explanation of the origins of this mission has become famous.

> We are told that one day some merchants who had recently arrived in Rome displayed their many wares in the crowded market-place. Among other merchandise Gregory saw some boys . . . for sale. These had fair complexions, fine-cut features,

> and fair hair. Looking at them with interest, he enquired what country and race they came from. "They come from Britain," he was told, "where all the people have this appearance." He then asked whether the people were Christians, or whether they were still ignorant heathens. "They are pagans," he was informed . . . . "What is the name of this race?" he asked. "They are called Angles," he was told. "That is appropriate," he said, "for they have angelic faces, and it is right that they should become fellow-heirs with the angels in heaven."[3]

Augustine and his companions arrived in Kent early in 597 where they were given a cordial reception by King Ethelbert and his Christian wife, Queen Bertha. The missionary was invited to an audience held in the open because the king feared magical trickery indoors. The king's response to a sermon by Augustine was, "your words and promises are fair indeed, but they are new and strange to us, and I cannot accept them and abandon the age-old beliefs of the whole English nation."[4]

Nevertheless, soon afterwards Ethelbert was converted, and at Christmastime 10,000 of his followers were also baptized. Augustine established the monastery of St. Peter and St. Paul at Canterbury to serve as a center of evangelistic activities, and eventually it became the mother church of all England. Inasmuch as the mission had been under the auspices of Pope Gregory, the new converts came under the primacy of Rome, using its liturgy and following its practices. But Gregory did not insist on this, as he wrote to Augustine:

> My brother, you are familiar with the usage of the Roman Church, in which you were brought up. But if you have found customs, whether in the Roman, Gallican, or any other Churches that may be more acceptable to God, I wish you to make a careful selection of them, and teach the Church of the English, which is still young in the Faith, whatever you can profitably learn from the various Churches. For things should not be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things.[5]

Gregory also permitted Augustine to adapt the old pagan

customs to Christian uses, such as the heathen Yule and the practice of sacrifices. The latter were henceforth to be permitted only "in praise of the true God." The correspondence between Gregory and Augustine reveals a great deal about early Christian mission methods and attitudes. In one of his instructions to Augustine, Gregory sets down the rules for the distribution of the church's funds which became normative for the medieval church.

> . . . all money received is to be allocated under four heads: one for the bishop and his household [that is, clergy], for hospitality and other commitments; another for the clergy; a third for the poor; and a fourth for the maintenance of churches.[6]

It is significant that fully one fourth of all revenues was to be used for the poor, and when one takes into consideration that the bishop's "hospitality" likewise included relief of the destitute, it appears that fully one third of the church's income was theoretically to be used for social work.

Augustine was not only confronted with the problem of evangelizing the pagans. When he arrived in England he also found remnants of the older Celtic church which had managed to survive the invasions of the 5th century. The Celtic bishops were suspicious of the newcomers from Rome, especially since their liturgy and customs differed from the old English. For instance, they disagreed on the date of Easter, on the manner of the tonsure (the cut of hair indicating a man was in holy orders), and in the organization of the church. Furthermore, the Celtic bishops were not at all enthusiastic about Augustine's mission work among the Anglo-Saxons who had so long oppressed them.

Bede tells a story which reveals something of the spirit of those times. The Celtic bishops asked an old monk whether they should submit to Augustine or not. The monk replied, "Yes, if he is a man of God." "How can we tell?" they asked. "If he is gentle and humble of heart," the monk answered. They asked how that could be determined. "Arrange it so that Augustine and his men arrive first at your meeting place. If he stands up when you arrive, it will prove that

he is a servant of Christ. In that case, do as he bids you." Unfortunately Augustine failed to rise as he greeted the Celts, and they refused to accept his leadership. In fact mutual hostility continued for at least another century, and the Welsh Christians refused to pray in the same churches as the Latins or eat meals with them.

About 630 King Edwin of Northumbria, the land north of the Humber River, married a Christian girl from Kent. She brought with her the monk Paulinus, who converted the king's court and introduced Christianity into the north country, establishing a second center of Christianity at York, which subsequently became England's second archepiscopal see.

But the real missionary of the north was Aiden, who established a monastery on Lindisfarne, an island on the east coast of Scotland. Aiden had come from Iona, the center of Celtic Christianity, so that much of northern England and Scotland began to follow the old English customs instead of the Latin forms more recently introduced by Augustine in the south. In 664 a conference was held at the monastery of Whitby on the Northumbrian coast at which representatives of the two sides met to discuss and resolve their differences.

The meeting was chaired by the Northumbrian king, Oswald. Abbot Colman, Aiden's successor at Lindisfarne, defended the Celtic practices, and Abbot Wilfrid of Ripon supported the Roman usages. The king was to judge the outcome. The two sides debated at some length, until finally Wilfrid appealed to the primacy of Peter and to Matt. 16:18 ("I will give unto you the keys of the kingdom of heaven") in support of the Roman practices. Bede tells the story. "Do you both agree . . . that these words were indisputably addressed to Peter in the first place, and that our Lord gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven?" the king asked. Both answered, "We do." The king concluded, "I shall not contradict him. I shall obey his commands in everything to the best of my knowledge and ability; otherwise, when I come to the gates of heaven, he who holds the keys may not be willing to open them."[7]

Whether this exchange is accurate it is impossible to

judge, but the Synod of Whitby did establish the Roman usages in the island, so that by 700, England was nominally Christian and followed the Latin customs. Shortly after this synod the pope sent Theodore of Tarsus as archbishop of Canterbury to organize the church by establishing dioceses and consecrating bishops. To him belongs the credit for bringing order and discipline to the English church, although Celtic Christianity maintained its independence from Rome for centuries, notably in Wales and Scotland.

The origins of Christianity in Ireland are uncertain, but St. Patrick of Armagh (d. 461) is credited with establishing the church among the Irish clans. He was born in England about 389, son of a deacon and grandson of a presbyter. At age 16 he was carried off during a raid by some pirates and sold to a devotee of druidism in Ireland. Here for 7 years he tended swine, which, a biographer informs us, became exceptionally good breeders. After being reunited with his parents, Patrick went off to Gaul where he spent 15 years with Germanus of Auxerre learning theology and secular literature. He was consecrated a bishop and returned to Ireland to preach.

The accounts of his missionary activities, mostly written years later, are filled with legends and miracles. According to his own account Patrick baptized thousands, ordained many priests, and preached throughout the island. He followed a dual method in his approach to the pagan: aiming at the conversion of the heads of clans and establishing numerous monasteries. Patrick established himself in the See of Armagh, which became the mother church for Ireland. Since towns or urban centers were practically nonexistent, Christianity radiated from monastic centers, which in turn became the administrative centers of the church. Therefore in Ireland it was the abbot, not the bishop, who guided the central administration, which was based on tribal and clannish units instead of dioceses. The pope was referred to as the "abbot of Rome" and occasionally Christ was called "the great abbot of God."

Irish monasticism was characterized by a severity which rivalled that of the Egyptian desert. It is here that we first find the practice of private confession and absolution and the

emergence of a penitential system. Irish Christianity was also marked by a strong individualism having considerably weaker ties with Rome than the English church had. During the 6th and 7th centuries the Irish monasteries became centers of learning and repositories of culture, giving the island ever after the title, "isle of saints and scholars."

From Ireland monks carried the faith to Scotland. In 563 an Irishman, Columba, together with 12 companions, established a monastery on Iona, a small (6-sq.-mi.) island off the west coast of Scotland. During the 34 years that he labored at Iona, Columba and his disciples established over one hundred churches and monasteries in Scotland and northern England. The oldest literary composition from Scotland, the *Altus Prosater* [The Great Creator], has been attributed to Columba. It speaks of creation, sin, and judgment, and is arranged so that each line begins with the succeeding letter of the alphabet. The opening lines:

> The High Creator, Ancient of Days and Unbegotten
> was without origin of beginning and without end;
> He is and shall be to infinite ages of ages
> with Whom is Christ, the only begotten, and the Holy Spirit,
> coeternal in the everlasting glory of the Godhead.
> We set forth not three gods, but we say there is One God,
> saving our faith in three most glorious Persons.[8]

In 635 some monks from Iona laid the foundations for the famous monastery at Lindisfarne, which became a second center of Celtic mission activities. Iona continued to flourish until the dissolution of the monasteries by Henry VIII in the 16th century.

THE CONTINENT

By the 5th century Christianity in Gaul was well over three hundred years old, but the church had fallen on evil days. Clovis, the leader of the Franks, had been given Christian baptism, together with 3,000 of his men, by the bishop of Rheims. They succeeded in baptizing most of the barbarian tribes between Paris and the Pyrenees. Under the Merovin-

gians, as the descendants of Clovis are known to history, Christianity expanded, but the secular princes thoroughly dominated the church. Christianity was often but a thin veneer covering a still vital Teutonic paganism. When the Merovingians exchanged their old German gods for Christ they were simply following an old Roman custom of adopting the religion of the ruler without experiencing a moral or intellectual conversion.

The most important historian of this period, Gregory of Tours (d. 594), describes the late 6th century in the prologue to his *History of the Franks.*

> In these times when the practice of letters declines, nay, rather perishes in the cities of Gaul, there has been found no scholar trained in the art of ordered composition to present . . . a picture of the things which have befallen . . . . there have been done good things many, and evil many; the peoples savagely raged; the fury of the kings grew sharp; churches were assailed by heretics and protected by catholics; the faith of Christ that glowed in many hearts was lukewarm in not a few; the faithful enriched the churches while the unbelievers stripped them bare. Wherefore the voice of lament was ofttimes raised, "Alas! For these our days!"[9]

Gregory continues by describing how avaricious laymen with the help of the king established themselves as abbots and bishops and how the gross manners of the nobility undermined Christian morality throughout the land.

This was the situation in Gaul when on a summer's day in 575 a shipload of Irish monks landed near Mount Saint Michael. Their leader was Columban, a physical giant and a moral rigorist who was determined to revive the Gallican church by preaching, moral example, disputation, and occasionally through feats of strength. Columban and his companions were the first wave of hundreds of Irish and English monks who were to cross the channel during the next two centuries to do mission work on the continent. The inspiration for this activity came from a principle of the monastic vocation, which was unique to the Celts, the *peregrinatio pro Christo,* voluntary exile for the purpose of

spreading the Gospel. The theory seems to have been akin to the early church's idea of "white martyrdom" as contrasted with blood martyrdom. Since the state was no longer persecuting the Christians, it behooved those who sought to test their faith to seek out other dangerous situations which demanded courage and privation. One of the best opportunities for heroic faith was presented by the challenge of multitudes who were still living in the clutches of paganism. It was here, in the vast stretches of European forests and marshes, that many missionary-monks succumbed to martyrdom in the pursuit of their apostolate.

Columban established a monastic house of Luxeuil in Gaul which served as a center for the revival of Christianity and the conversion of the pagans. The Celts encountered considerable hostility from the neighboring bishops, not only because their mission was a judgment upon the existing church, but also because they followed the Celtic assumption that the abbot was superior to any bishop. The Irish also asserted their independence from episcopal control by observing a different date for Easter than that of the Gallican church. In fact Columban took it upon himself to write to Pope Gregory the Great in imperious terms:

> Do you bid us, Holy Father, to keep a Victorian Easter on the twenty-first or twenty-second day of the moon? But the moon rises at this time of the month after midnight, and the night's darkness is greater at this season than its light. Why do you keep a *dark* Easter, you, the diffuser of light throughout the world? Surely you know that Anatolius, that most learned man, who was praised by Jerome himself, declared this to be wrong, saying that the Resurrection of the Lord is a Feast of light, not of darkness. Please spare us the scandal of seeing you, our Father, at variance with Saint Jerome. For anyone in the Western Church who disagrees with *him* must be banned as a heretic, no matter who it be.[10]

Columban's rigorism can be seen reflected especially in the rule he laid down for his monks. Whoever failed to make the sign of the cross over his spoon at dinner was punished with six strokes of the lash, and whoever did not

kneel to receive a blessing when entering or leaving the monastery received 12 strokes. There were likewise punishments for failure to say grace at table, and remarks which detracted from the abbot were classified with homicide. In 603 the Gallican bishops called a council to discipline Columban, but when he appeared he fearlessly lectured the assembled prelates on their vices. He went too far, however, when he threatened the king with excommunication and denounced the vicious life of Queen Brunhilde, calling her a new Jezebel. She expelled him from Gaul, but he succeeded in jumping ship, traversing the length of Gaul, and founding a new monastery on Lake Constance which became known as St. Gall after St. Gall, who accompanied him. After three years Columban left there and established another monastery at Bobbio in Lombardy, where he died in 615. Altogether this heroic saint established over 40 monasteries which served as mission centers in Europe.

The first territory to be evangelized outside the old Roman boundaries on the Continent was Belgium, Holland, and the coasts of the North Sea inhabited by the Frisians. About 690 an Anglo-Saxon who had spent 12 years in an Irish monastery arrived on the shores of Frisia with 11 companions. He was Willibrord, known to history as the "Apostle of Frisia." Three years later he travelled to Rome to secure papal authorization and support for his work, and shortly after this visit he was consecrated an archbishop, with Utrecht as his center of operations. Thus Willibrord inaugurated that alliance between the papacy and Anglo-Saxon mission endeavors which would closely bind the continental church to the authority of the Roman See. Willibrord was also supported in his work by Pepin, king of the Franks, who was not above using Christianity as an instrument for Frankish expansion. Alcuin, Willibrord's biographer, describes the success of his activity.

> He traversed every part of the country, exhorting the people in cities, villages and forts where he had previously preached the Gospel to remain loyal to the faith and their good resolutions. And as the number of the faithful increased day by day and a considerable multitude of believers came to the knowl-

> edge of God's Word, many began in their zeal for the faith to make over to the man of God their hereditary properties. These he accepted. Shortly afterward he ordered churches to be built there, and he appointed priests and deacons to serve them, so that the new converts should have places where they could assemble on feast days and listen to wholesome instruction and where they could learn the principles of the Christian religion from those servants of God who had baptized them. Thus the man of God, favored by divine grace, made increasing progress from day to day.[11]

The best known and most successful Anglo-Saxon missionary was Winfrid of Nursling, later known as Boniface, who for 30 years consolidated the existing churches and pushed the frontiers of Christianity north to Scandinavia. He was born in Wessex about 680, and from age five was reared in English monasteries. In 716 he went to Frisia to assist Willibrord for a short time. He worked closely with the popes, maintaining a regular and detailed correspondence with Rome. In 722 he was consecrated bishop and in 732 archbishop, having as his sphere of operation that part of Germany east of the Rhine and north of the Danube. Pope Gregory II had outlined Boniface's mission in a letter dated 719:

> You are to teach them [the pagans] the service of the kingdom of God by persuading them to accept the truth in the name of Christ, the Lord our God . . . . instil into their minds the teaching of the Old and New Testaments, doing this in a spirit of love and moderation, and with arguments suited to their understanding . . . . You will insist upon using the sacramental discipline prescribed in the official ritual formulary of the Holy Apostolic See.[12]

Five years later Boniface received a letter from the bishop of Winchester advising him on the proper approach to the pagans, "to show how . . . you may overcome with the least possible resistance this barbarous people." The bishop warned against arguing with the pagans about their gods, as this would merely antagonize them. Rather, the

missionary should frequently remind them of the works of the Christian God, the universality of the faith, and the omnipotence of the Creator. "From time to time their superstitions should be compared with our Christian dogmas and touched upon indirectly," but this should not be done "in an offensive and irritating way."[13] On at least one occasion Boniface took more direct action. His biographer, Willibald, offers this account:

> Boniface, in . . . [the presence of the Hessians] attempted to cut down, at a place called Geismar, a certain oak of extraordinary size called by the pagans of olden times the Oak of Jupiter. Taking his courage in his hands (for a great crowd of pagans stood by watching and bitterly cursing in their hearts the enemy of the gods) he cut the first notch. But when he had made a superficial cut, suddenly the oak's vast bulk, shaken by a mighty blast of wind from above, crashed to the ground shivering its topmost branches into fragments in its fall. As if by the express will of God (for the brethren present had done nothing to cause it) the oak burst asunder into four parts, each having a trunk of equal length. At the sight of this extraordinary spectacle the heathens who had been cursing ceased to revile and began, on the contrary, to believe and bless the Lord.[14]

Like other Anglo-Saxons before him, Boniface was supported by the Carolingian rulers who tended to identify Christian baptism with acknowledgement of Frankish control. For several years Boniface travelled under the safe conduct of Charles Martel. It was this identification of Christianity with a political system which caused the faith to be resisted in some quarters.

Boniface used monks as his missionaries, though he began the practice of using women evangelists as well, and he established more than 60 monastic houses in Germany. The most famous of these was at Fulda, established in 743 as the motherhouse of Germany, where Boniface's tomb remains to this day. In 747 he established an archepiscopal see at Mainz, which became the center of German Christianity. After 741 he undertook a thorough reform of the Franco-

German church by holding a series of five councils in which laymen participated alongside bishops. In 751 he anointed Pepin the Short, father of Charlemagne, as king of the Franks, thus inaugurating the long line of Carolingian kings who would dominate European affairs for two centuries. Already in his mid-70s, he decided to return to Frisia to continue evangelism there. While waiting for some converts to arrive to receive confirmation, he was set upon by some pagans and murdered, thus sealing his lifelong labors with "red martyrdom." A modern historian has observed, "It was the Anglo-Saxon monks and above all St. Boniface who first realized that union of Teutonic initiative and Latin order which is the source of the whole medieval development of culture."[15]

SAXONY AND SCANDINAVIA

The conversion of the Saxons was associated with Frankish imperialism more than any other missionary enterprise on the continent. In 772 Charlemagne undertook a campaign against the Saxons in order to "win them for Christ" by force of arms and through the destruction of their idols. Missionaries were sent into Westphalia to begin the work of evangelism, and hostages were taken from the Saxons to insure their safety. Two of the monks sent to preach were Willehad and Sturmio. In 777 at Paderborn most of the Saxon chieftains submitted to Charlemagne, and the sign of their submission was the reception of Christian baptism. One leader, Widukind, was absent, and he became the center of Saxon resistance to Charlemagne and Christianity. For the next 8 years Widukind and his men raided in Frankish territory, penetrating as far as the left bank of the Rhine, while Charlemagne was engaged elsewhere in defense of his kingdom. In 782 the king of the Franks lost all restraint when he beheaded 4,500 Saxons for being traitors and murderers. Finally, in 785 Widukind's resistance was broken, and the Saxon received Christian baptism. It was about this time that Charlemagne took his revenge by promulgating the bloody Capitulary [ordinance] on Saxony, which said in part:

> If any one, out of contempt for Christianity, shall have despised the holy Lenten fast and shall have eaten flesh, let him be punished by death . . . . If any one of the race of the Saxons hereafter concealed among them shall have wished to hide himself unbaptized, and shall have scorned to come to baptism and shall have wished to remain a pagan, let him be punished by death.[16]

But this repressive measure was not without its critics. Alcuin, Charlemagne's chief counsellor, wrote to him immediately.

> According to St. Augustine faith is an act of the will and cannot be enforced . . . . A man can be forced into accepting baptism but not faith . . . . is it really good to impose on barbarians, who have just recently been introduced to the Christian faith, the full burden of the tithes? . . . Would it not be better to consider the attitude of the apostles? . . . Careful consideration should also be given to the proper order of preaching and the dispensation of sacraments: for little benefit will accrue to the body by the ablutions of sacred baptism unless the soul has first accepted the truth of the Catholic faith on rational grounds.[17]

He wrote to Charlemagne's chamberlain that if the sweet Gospel of Christ were preached with as much vigor as Charlemagne's laws were enforced, perhaps the Saxons would be more easily converted. Apparently Alcuin's admonitions were heeded, since the king very shortly repealed or mitigated the Capitulary on the Saxons. Thus the way was opened for the last great apostle to Saxony, Liudger [Ludger] (d. 809) a pupil of Alcuin, who became the bishop of Münster. Two of his disciples, Adalhard and Wala, founded the monastery of New Corbie which served as a missionary center for Saxony as Fulda had for northern Germany.

The conversion of the Saxons paved the way for the evangelization of Scandinavia, which was inaugurated through a fortuitous diplomatic negotiation. King Harald [Harold] of Denmark sought the aid of Louis the Pious, son of Charlemagne, in his contest for the Danish throne. Louis suggested that aid would be assured if Harald would

espouse the Christian faith, and in May of 826 Bishop Ebbo of Rheims baptized the Danish king, his family, and 400 warriors. The way was thus opened for Ansgar, a monk of New Corbie, to begin preaching the Gospel in Denmark and Sweden. In 831 the pope created Hamburg an archepiscopal see to serve as a center for Scandinavian missions, and Ansgar became its first archbishop. Several years later the new center was destroyed by Norse pirates, and in 848 Pope Nicolas I established Hamburg-Bremen as a united archdiocese for the work of missions to the north. Ansgar, who continued his work until his death in 865, has become known to historians as the "Apostle of the North." The eradication of paganism in Sweden took much longer than in the rest of Scandinavia. In the 12th century the Cistercian monks took a lead in the work, and it was not until 1164 that Sweden received its first metropolitan see when Pope Alexander III conferred this dignity on Uppsala.

The conversion of Denmark was facilitated when the German emperor, Otto I, defeated Harald, king of the Danes, in the middle of the 10th century. An early chronicler states, "A meeting between Emperor Otto and the King of the Danes was arranged at Morsö. There the holy bishop Poppo explained the Catholic faith to King Harald. He carried a red hot iron in his hand and showed the king that it did not burn him. Then King Harald and the entire Danish army were baptized." The same chronicler continues, "After King Harald had accepted Catholicism he sent men throughout his entire kingdom ordering that everybody should be baptized and accept the true faith . . . he used force and severe punishment when he could not do otherwise."[18]

The conversion of Norway came about from its close ties with England rather than from the Continent. King Haakon the Good (938–961), who was raised and educated as a Christian at the Anglo-Saxon court, was unsuccessful in his attempts to convert the Norsemen, but King Olaf Tryggvesson (995–1000) who was baptized in England, and King Olaf Haroldsson (Saint Olaf, 1014–1030) did much to spread Christianity in Norway. Tryggvesson, according to the chronicler, first elicited a promise from his men to follow him in whatever he did. Then he announced "that he would

make Catholics of all men in his realm . . . . He asked all men to become Christians. He punished severely those who refused. Some . . . [were] killed, others were mutilated, and some were driven out of the country. And so it happened that in the whole kingdom . . . all the people accepted Christianity . . . ."[19] This same king, perhaps inspired by the example of Boniface, convinced a large number of doubters on one occasion when he pushed over a statue of the god Thor without suffering any reprisals from the impotent statue. Christianity became even more firmly rooted in the north when Canute of Denmark, a staunch Christian and supporter of the papacy, was sole ruler of Norway, Denmark, and England (1016–1030). Lund, the center of Christian missions in Norway, became an independent archbishopric in 1104. Iceland received Christianity from Norway during the time Tryggvesson was king. The missionary who is given credit for this work is Dankbrand of Bremen. He succeeded in winning over a number of pagans to Christian baptism, but his most important convert was the king of Iceland, who, "1,000 years after the birth of Christ made Christianity a law in Iceland."[20]

MISSIONS TO THE EAST

During the course of the 8th century, Christian expansion to the East closely followed the victorious armies of Charlemagne, although the real task of evangelization was left to later Carolingians. In 805 Charlemagne conquered the Czechs, and in 845 fourteen Czech chieftains were baptized in Regensburg at the court of Charlemagne's grandson. The Avars were conquered by Charles in 796 and accepted the faith, but they became absorbed by their Slavic neighbors and by the 9th century had lost their identity.

Of great interest to missiologists is the conversion of Moravia and Bohemia by two celebrated brothers, Cyril and Methodius. Frankish missionaries had ventured into these territories already during the 8th century but with little success. In 863 King Ratislav of Moravia petitioned the Eastern emperor for missionaries to preach the Gospel, and he was sent Cyril and Methodius. They had grown up

in Thessalonica and were familiar with the Slavic customs and language. Cyril invented an alphabet (today called Cyrillic, the ancestor of modern Russian) and translated portions of the Bible and liturgy into Slavonic. After 4 years of fruitful activity in Moravia they were summoned to Rome by the pope who sanctioned their liturgy and ordained them bishops. This incident illustrates that in the 9th century Christendom was still considered a unity, and the East acknowledged the preeminence of the papacy. Cyril died in 869, but Methodius returned to become the first archbishop of Moravia. From there Christianity spread into Bohemia. In the work of these two brothers we see some marked differences in approach between the Eastern and Western missionaries. Cyril and Methodius developed a new language and liturgy as teaching devices. The faith was presented to the people not as a foreign element but rather as something indigenous to their culture. We also know that the Eastern missionaries were far more concerned with presenting dogma to the pagans than were the Westerners. On the debit side, the Eastern missionaries were sent by their ruler and were under his tutelage, whereas in the West they maintained a sense of independence from political control, although they used the political arm when it suited their purposes.

Bulgaria was evangelized at the same time as Moravia and Bohemia. King Boris received Christian baptism about 865, after his kingdom had been conquered by the Eastern emperor. In order to assert his independence from Eastern control, he suggested to the pope that Bulgaria follow the Latin forms of Christianity, provided the pope would establish a patriarchal see in Bulgaria equal in dignity to Constantinople. The pope refused to do this, and Bulgaria reverted to the Eastern customs. In 870 a Bulgar archbishop was consecrated by the Eastern patriarch, and by 900 the kingdom was at least nominally Christian. Bulgaria became the center of missions to the Slavs.

The Saxonian emperors of Germany (919–1024) promoted the eastward expansion of Christianity as a means of extending their territorial control. Some historians see in this policy the beginnings of the German "drive to the East"

which has played a large part in European history. Otto I (936–973) first spread Christianity, and with it German influence, into Denmark, where he founded three new bishoprics. Pushing to the East he organized five "marches" (frontier states) along the Slavic border, at the same time establishing six new bishoprics, including Magdeburg and Brandenburg. In 968 the first Polish bishopric was erected by Otto at Posen. Although the first bishops there were German, the Poles succeeded in maintaining their ecclesiastical independence by resisting Otto's efforts to make Posen subject to Magdeburg. Hungary was evangelized by German missionaries sent by Otto II (973–83), who negotiated a treaty with Duke Geisa permitting missionaries to enter the territory. Geisa's son was the famous St. Stephen (997–1038), who became the founder of Christian Hungary. Thus the Eastward thrust of Christianity owed much to the initiative of the German Saxon princes, who like Charlemagne combined conversion with colonization.

Russia derived its faith from Constantinople and the Greeks. During the middle of the 9th century, Scandinavian "Vikings" settled around Kiev, which subsequently became their capital and the center of Russian Christianity. It was these Norsemen who organized and controlled this territory, and one version of the name Russia derives it from the Slavic name for the Scandinavians, Ruotsi. About the year 987 King Vladimir, in order to derive the benefits of a superior Greek culture, married the sister of the Eastern emperor and allowed himself to be baptized. He together with his men forcibly rooted out the worship of idols, and they introduced into Russia the Slavonic Bible and liturgy which had come to them from Cyril via Moravia and Bulgaria. The Russian church was therefore closely allied with Byzantine Christianity, but it retained its own language, customs, and rites.

ISLAM AND SPAIN

While Christianity was slowly spreading from its Mediterranean cradle to the less hospitable areas of Russia, Europe, and Britain, more spectacular events were taking place further south and east. There lived in Mecca, a city

in Arabia, a caravan trader named Mohammed who claimed to have revelations from God. He began to preach the doctrines of resurrection, monotheism, and justice towards the poor. He also taught that God, or Allah, had manifested himself through great religious leaders in the past, including Jesus of Nazareth. Allah's final and complete manifestation had come in Mohammed. In 622 he was expelled from Mecca, partly because of his lofty social ethics, and he went to Medina (The City of the Prophet). This event, known as the *Hegira,* is usually taken as the starting point of Islam. Mohammed died in Medina in 632.

Thirty years after the *Hegira* a collection of Mohammed's sayings called the Koran (recitation) was made; this became the Bible of the religion. Mohammed's followers were known as Moslems, meaning "he who submits himself utterly to God," and the religion was called Islam. The five pillars of the faith are: the profession of faith (there is no god but Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet); a ritual prayer; almsgiving; the fast of the month of Ramadan; and a pilgrimage to Mecca, the holy city of the Moslems. Later they developed the idea of the "jehad" or holy war to spread the faith. Paradise was depicted in highly materialistic, even sensual, terms. A believer who fell in battle contending for the faith was said to enter heaven directly and enjoy privileged rewards. Part of Islam's attractiveness lay in its stringent morality, its discipline, and its simplicity. Mohammed borrowed a great deal from Judaism and Christianity in his preaching, and this syncretism probably commended the faith to dissidents from the other religions.

The rapid spread of Islam was breathtaking. The Arab army, impelled by religious idealism, swept everything before it. Damascus fell in 635, Jerusalem in 638, Alexandria in 643, and by 711 all of North Africa had capitulated. The Moslems also swept northward to Constantinople and seemed destined to conquer the very capital of Eastern Christianity when they were defeated before the walls of the city in 718 by Emperor Leo III (the Isaurian). Thereafter Constantinople served as a bulwark against Islam for Christian Europe until she fell to the Turks in 1453, and the Moslems continued as far as Vienna (1529).

To what can we attribute the rapid decline of Christianity in the lands of Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Athanasius, and a host of noble martyrs? Although the Bedouin armies were well organized and formidable, a large part of the answer lies in the religious and political particularism of Egypt and North Africa. Nominally these areas were part of the Eastern Roman empire, but they never felt especially loyal to Byzantium which was oppressive and interfering in its control. In some cases the North Africans looked upon the Moslems as deliverers instead of conquerors. The North African church had also become alienated from both Rome and Constantinople. During the 6th century when Eastern Christianity had been torn by a number of theological dissensions over the nature of Christ, the emperors had tried to impose a uniform orthodox dogma on the empire. The Africans, ever jealous of their independence, resented such interference. Now when the Moslems conquered a town they often permitted the Christians a great deal of latitude in belief, granting them the toleration which had been denied by the Christian emperors. Furthermore, the African church was itself torn by internal strife, offering weak opposition when confronted by Islam. Christianity died out, and by 1050 there were only five bishops left in all of Africa, their flocks comprising foreign merchants and Christian prisoners.

The fall of Spain followed that of Africa, but it was even more rapid. In 711 the Moslem general Tarik crossed the straits of Jebel—whence the modern Gibraltar (Jebel-Tarik). Within 9 years the Moslems dominated the peninsula, and they continued northward into France until they were stopped by Charles Martel in 732 at the battle of Tours. Three reasons are often suggested for the demise of Christian Spain. Like their coreligionists in Africa, the Christians of Spain could think of nothing else than fighting each other on points of doctrine, while Islam used one side against the other. The Spanish church was also closely identified with the state, that is, the ruling Visigoths. When the state fell, the church fell with it. It is also a fact that the Jews had been oppressed by the Christians through forced conversions and baptisms, and they tended to side with the Moslems. But Christianity was not eclipsed altogether. Pockets of

resistance remained to form the nucleus of reconquest. The Spanish church developed its own liturgy and customs which have been given the name Mozarabic, and throughout much of the medieval period the Moslems, Jews, and Christians in Spain lived side by side in relative harmony. Spain was the door through which classical influences entered Europe to inspire the renaissance of the 12th century, a reawakening which owed much to the culture of Islam. But the Christians continued to resist the infidel. One heroic figure in the reconquest of Spain is the famous El Cid (Ruy Diaz de Bivar), who in the late 11th century played a conspicuous part in pushing the Moslems out of Castille. Not until 1492, when Ferdinand and Isabella finally expelled the Moslems from Granada, was Spain again nominally Christian. From the 7th to the 11th century the Mediterranean was controlled by the Moslems. They displaced the Byzantines in southern Italy, and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica likewise succumbed to their control. This situation prevailed until the early 12th century, when the Norsemen established themselves in southern Italy.

MISSION METHODS

When Christian missionaries ventured into pagan territory, they first established a self-sufficient monastic community, planted crops, acquired herds, and built buildings. Using the monastery as their home base, they travelled wide stretches of territory, contacting pagans wherever they could be found. Their numbers were usually small. Among the Benedictines and the Irish, 12 men were required to found a monastery. One can trace the activities of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries on the continent by noting the monastic houses they established. The missionaries remained in close contact with their mother house, never wandering too far from their center. This was true of Willibrord, Liudger, Willibald, and Wynnebald; provisions were made for their return to the monastery to report on their activities. The lists of missionaries at Salzburg gives evidence that they also had adopted a system of rotation.

What was the content of missionary preaching? A pri-

mary objective was undermining the pagan religion by demonstrating its impotence through a comparison with Christianity. After a group of pagans had been assembled they were addressed in their native tongue. Part of a sermon by Willibrord has come to us:

> It is not God that you worship but the devil, who has deceived you, O King, into the vilest error, so that he might deliver your soul to eternal flames. For there is no God except the one God who created the heavens, the earth, and the sea and everything which is in them.[21]

A later sermon preached by a missionary to these same Saxons attacks the pagan gods:

> The statues which you believe to be gods, and which you, deceived by the devil, worship, are only gold or brass or stone or wood. They do not live, they do not move, they do not think. They are the work of men. Not one of them could be of help to itself or to anyone else.[22]

Louis the Pious, son of Charlemagne, instructed an archbishop on the proper way to present Christianity to the pagan Danes:

> They ought to give up their vain ways. It is a sin for a man who possesses reason to render worship to metal statues. How can Jupiter or Neptune or any of the gods which they worship or the images which they shape with their hands aid them? These miserable people practice a useless cult. They address their prayers to deaf and mute gods. They sacrifice to demons what ought to be given to God. It is evil to try to placate our God with the blood of beasts; He loves the holy prayers of men much more. Enough time has been given to these evil errors; the time has come to cut away the condemned religions.[23]

The missionaries do not seem to have spent much time expounding Christian theology on the assumption that this could wait until after baptism. Alcuin, in the letter cited above (Note 17) deplores this lack, and suggests that Christianity

might be more readily accepted if doctrine were taught first. This omission did not hold in the East, where Cyril, Methodius, and their disciples spent much time indoctrinating their converts in the Trinity, Christology, and the church. In the West the attacks against idolatry were sometimes accompanied by actual destruction: witness Boniface at the oak of Geismar and Tryggvesson's toppling of Thor. The missionaries also painted heaven and hell in vivid colors for their impressionable hearers.

The missionary endeavor was certainly assisted by the strong arm of the state, which at least created a situation favorable to evangelism. An example of such a situation resulting from international diplomacy is represented by the terms drawn up between Harald of Denmark and Louis the Pious:

> He came to the most serene emperor, Louis, requesting that he be considered worthy to receive his help so that he would be able to regain his kingdom. Louis kept him with him for some time and urged him through personal persuasions and those of others to accept the Christian faith, because thus there would be more friendship between them and because the Christian people would more promptly and willingly come to his aid if both people worshipped the same god.[24]

We must be careful not to judge these kings too harshly. They were genuine Christians convinced that God had given them material power to carry on the spread of Christianity. They looked upon the church as the City of God, as an island surrounded by a sea of pagans. It was their responsibility to bring more and more pagans into the fold by whatever means. They were convinced that their position was that of a wise father, who at times had to use force for the good of the child. Their brand of evangelistic imperialism should not be equated with the more cynical type pursued during the 19th century. The missionaries could not depend upon continued support from the state in any case, because eventually the armies of occupation would have to be withdrawn for service elsewhere, and the evangelist was invariably left on his own.

With very few exceptions, the missionaries sought the conversion of the king and aristocracy first, since the chieftains usually determined the religious beliefs of the people. But we cannot help deploring the tactics used by many kings who imposed faith upon their people by force.

Occasionally we find Christians offering outright bribes to the pagans. Ebo of Rheims went to Denmark, where "in order to win souls he distributed much money and added many to the Christian religion," and Ansgar [Anskar], apostle to Scandinavia, "tried to conciliate . . . [the Danish king] with gifts . . . in order that he might gain permission to preach in his kingdom." [25]

The moral examples and Christian integrity of the missionaries also impressed the pagans. Almost all the biographers of these pioneer evangelists stress the fact that the pagans were won over by their charity, patience, mercy, and superior way of life. Willibrord helped beggars. Boniface and Gregory braved warfare, pestilence, and famine with the people rather than flee to safer territory. Liudger ate with paupers as well as with the rich. Willibrord restrained his followers from killing a man who had just made an attempt on his life. It is clear that many of the missionaries cultivated a close personal bond with their converts, and multitudes flocked to their tombs after death.

By the beginning of the 12th century Christianity had triumphed over paganism in most of Europe, at least to the extent that in many minds Christendom and Europe were synonymous.

NOTES—CHAPTER 1

1. Gregory the Great, Migne, *PL* 76, col. 1009—1010.
2. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. Henry Davis in *Ancient Christian Writers* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950) XI, 21, 23, 60, 58.
3. Bede, *A History of the English Church and People*, trans. Leo Sherley-Price (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1965), p. 98.
4. Ibid., p. 69.
5. Ibid., pp. 72—73.
6. Ibid., p. 72.
7. Ibid., p. 188.
8. St. Columba, *Altus Prosater* from *The Irish Liber Hymnorum*, ed. J. H. Bernard and R. A. Atkinson (London: Henry Bradshaw Society, 1898), II, 150.

9. Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks*, trans. O. M. Dalton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927), II, pref., 2.
10. Cited by Eleanor Shipley Duckett, *Gateway to the Middle Ages—Monasticism* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, c. 1938, paperback, 1961), p. 104.
11. Cited by C. H. Talbot, trans. and ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954), p. 11.
12. Ibid., p. 68.
13. Ibid., pp. 76—78.
14. Ibid., pp. 45—46.
15. Christopher Dawson, *The Making of Europe* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1946), p. 168.
16. *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae*, cited in *The Era of Charlemagne*, ed. Stewart C. Easton and Helene Wieruszowski (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Anvil, 1961), p. 119.
17. Ibid., p. 122.
18. *Snorris Königsbuch* (Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1922), I, 226—228, trans. Conrad Zimmermann, O.S.B., and Gunther Rolfson, O.S.B., cited by Colman J[ames] Barry, *Readings in Church History*, I (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960), 278.
19. Ibid., p. 279.
20. Ibid., p. 283.
21. Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi*, c. 11, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Scriptores rerum Merov. VII, 123, (1920); in Richard E. Sullivan, "The Carolingian Missionary and the Pagan," *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953) 717.
22. Hucbald, *Vita sancti Lebwini*, XII, Migne *PL* 132, col. 889; in Sullivan, p. 717.
23. Cited by Sullivan, p. 718.
24. Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, c. 7; in Sullivan, p. 724.
25. Rimbert, *Vita Anskarii*, c. 13 and 24; in Sullivan, p. 726.

CHAPTER 2 •

THE CHURCH IN FEUDAL SOCIETY

FEUDALISM

Feudalism is a comprehensive term used to describe the European structure of society roughly between A. D. 900 and 1200. It was never planned coherently nor did medieval men think in terms of a broad feudal theory. The word itself was not coined until the 19th century.

Basically feudalism was derived from two distinct traditions—Roman and Germanic—involving personal and economic bonds. The personal element came from the late Roman practice of patronage whereby an aristocrat surrounded himself with clients who served him while he in turn saw to their needs. A similar tradition was known among the Germans, whose leaders were attended by a circle of warriors called the *Gefolge* (or *comitatus).* In both cases the bond between leader and follower was expressed through a personal oath of loyalty. When the fusion of cultures took place in the early Middle Ages, one institution passed over into the other, and the personal bond between a wealthy or powerful lord and his retainers became a fixed practice known as *vassalage* which was entered into by the ceremony of *homage.* The church superimposed the oath of *fidelitas* (fealty) wherein the vassal swore on the Gospels, relics, or sacred objects to observe the terms of the contract. A description of the rite is extant from the early 12th century:

> First they did their homage thus; the count asked if he was willing to become completely his man, and the other replied, "I am willing," and with clasped hands, surrounded by the hands of the count, they were bound together by a kiss.

> Secondly, he who had done homage gave his fealty to the representative of the count in these words; "I promise on my faith that I will in the future be faithful to count William and will observe my homage to him completely against all persons in good faith and without deceit," and thirdly, he took his oath to this upon the relics of the saints.[1]

The second basic ingredient of feudalism was the economic bond stemming from the Roman system of land tenure known as *precarium*. In the late empire the tax burdens and other obligations of small landowners became so crushing that many of them deeded their land to large estate owners who then assumed their debts. The farmer retained the use of his land, but at his death it usually became the possession of the estate owner. Although the Germans had no comparable institution, their kings and war leaders often rewarded their followers by distributing large tracts of land to them, and in return the user of the land was bound to supply the king with warriors or rent. The actual plot of land was at first called a *precaria*, but later it was known as a benefice, and when it became hereditable, a *fief*. It was a lease of land for a definite period of time in return for rent or services. The ceremony through which a man was given use of a fief was known as *investiture*. When the economic bond represented by the fief combined with the personal oath of loyalty in vassalage, Europe was well on its way toward feudalism. Charles Martel, grandfather of Charlemagne, is generally credited with effecting this combination. In the 720s he confiscated large tracts of ecclesiastical lands to distribute among his dependent warriors, enabling them to raise more troops and defray their expenses. Charles demanded a pledge of personal loyalty as a precondition for receiving the use of the land.

Entering into a state of vassalage did not involve loss of prestige or social standing. Lords and vassals belonged to the same class of landed nobility. Most lords were also vassals. Such relationships often became quite complex, since one lord could be another's vassal on one piece of land, but their position might be reversed on a second holding. For instance, the king of England, who also happened to be

the duke of Normandy in France, was a vassal of the king of France in Normandy, but he was his equal as king in England. On the other hand, the king of France might be England's vassal on other lands. Some princes held dozens of estates scattered throughout Europe, each involving a different set of loyalties and feudal contracts. A vassal was bound to fight for his lord, but when a man had many lords and they were fighting with one another it became difficult for the vassal to choose whom to serve. The introduction of a *liege lord,* the one to whom a vassal owed first *allegiance,* served partially to clarify a man's loyalties in such circumstances. Such complexities were the source of endless litigation and frequent warfare among the feudal nobility.

Theoretically the king stood at the apex of the feudal pyramid, but in actual practice the king's vassals were often more powerful than he. By A. D. 1000 the process of decentralization in France had progressed to the point where the king held only a small portion of land around Paris. William the Conqueror, who invaded England from Normandy in A. D. 1066, imposed a strongly centralized feudalism there. The Germanies also had strong kingship for most of the Middle Ages, but during the 14th century the cities and local princes asserted themselves, and by Luther's day there were over 300 semiautonomous units which made up Germany.

It is clear that feudalism could function only so long as wealth was reckoned on the basis of land. By A. D. 1200, however, a commercial revolution had taken place, accompanied by the rise of many cities. With the increasing availability of money it was no longer necessary to hold land in order to maintain oneself, and feudalism was on its way out. Together with the growth of capitalism Europe witnessed a rising tide of nationalism and the emergence of strongly centralized national states. By A. D. 1300 England, Spain, and France were conscious of themselves as political units under the rule of strong monarchs.

Churches and the clergy, by holding lands under various forms of tenure, became a part of the feudal system. There was no alternative, for holding land was the sole means of support under this economy, but each "holding" carried

with it the obligation of rent or service to the lord. Thus the church became enmeshed, both as lord and vassal, in the feudal complex.

When a bishop or monastery functioned as a lord there was often involved the management of thousands of acres of property farmed by many serfs on widely scattered manors. "As early as A. D. 816 the Council of Aachen classified the clergy into three" groups "according to wealth: those having from 3,000 to 8,000 holdings; those having from 1,000 to 3,000 holdings; and those having fewer than 1,000."[2] This meant that entire towns, forests, roads, waterways, fairs, and other economic assets would be under the supervision of clergymen. It also meant that the ecclesiastical lord was under obligation to protect the property and see to its improvement. In some cases the more gifted clergy would rise to these administrative posts, leaving the lesser talented men to serve the spiritual needs of the people.

Ecclesiastical lords were also vassals under obligation of service to other lords. This relationship resulted in count-bishops going to battle, having in their entourage numerous clergy-knights. Although canon law forbade the shedding of blood by a clergyman, the law was not always observed. Some scholars claim the use of the mace (a kind of club) helped salve the consciences of those clerics who at least wished to observe the letter of the law.

Abuses crept into the church when kings or princes rewarded their secular vassals by bestowing church property on them. In a number of instances unworthy lords actually moved into monasteries with their families and friends, bringing serious disorder into the observances of the house.

The church also accumulated to itself land which carried no other obligations than prayer for those who gave it. Such holdings were called *immunities* since they were literally immune from most outside interference, or as a 13th century historian described them, "lands in which the king's writ did not run." Naturally acquisitive instincts prompted some churches to extend their properties, but others received great wealth in spite of themselves. A popular practice, especially among the elderly, was to deed property to a church or monastery with the understanding that the church

would care for them in their old age and pray for them after death, when the property would become a permanent holding of the church. This practice, the medieval equivalent of social security, had the added advantage of prayers for the repose of the benefactors. Another source of land grants was the troubled consciences of princes who thereby hoped for clemency in eternity.

Theoretically every church or monastery was under the jurisdiction of the local bishop, but in actual fact a large number of them were completely controlled by lay lords. Princes often built chapels on their property or in their castles, reserving to themselves the right to appoint the priest, often one of their own serfs, and to enjoy the revenues. These were called *proprietary* churches *(eigenkirchen)*. It was shrewd business for a lay lord to found ecclesiastical establishments, for they returned to the owner considerable income with the added benefit of a reputation for piety. Monasteries likewise erected chapels and appointed priests, a practice which usually was detrimental to the local parish church.

THE PAPACY

By the 7th century the theory of papal primacy in the church was fairly well established in the West. However, the popes from A. D. 555 to 752 accepted the idea of imperial tutelage. All of them sought ratification of their election from the Eastern emperor, and at least eight popes during these two centuries were from Byzantium. This situation changed when the papacy created a Western emperor in the person of Charlemagne. All popes thereafter were from the West, and they tended to resist control by the secular princes.

The theoretical basis for papal power lay in the claims of the bishop of Rome to be the vicar of Christ on earth. This was based on Rome's interpretation of Christ's words to Peter (Math. 16:13-19) and was given powerful expression by Innocent I (409–417), Leo I (440–461), and Gregory I (590–604). The theory of papal primacy was not fully realized in actual fact, however, until the pontificate of Innocent III (1198–1216).

Although the theory of papal infallibility had not yet become an article of faith, popes were the final authorities in matters of dogma and discipline. To rebel against them was tantamount to rebellion against God. They retained the sole right of creating cardinals, ratifying the election of bishops, authenticating relics, canonizing saints, and of absolving grave sins.

From the 4th century until A. D. 1309 the popes lived at the palace of the Lateran in Rome which had been given to the church by Constantine. The pope's cathedral church (his seat of authority as bishop of Rome) has always remained the Lateran basilica, known today as St. John Lateran, one of Rome's four major churches.

During the early Middle Ages popes were generally chosen by the clergy and nobility of Rome, with the agreement of the cardinals and the consent of the emperor. In A. D. 1059 Pope Nicolas II sought to remove secular influence from papal elections, and he decreed that henceforth they were to be elected solely by the cardinals:

> . . . when the Pontiff of the Universal Roman Church dies, the Cardinal-Bishops shall first take counsel together with most diligent consideration, thereupon call in to themselves the Cardinal-Clerics and then, in the same manner, the remaining clergy and people shall approach to express their consent to the new election.[3]

During the century following this decree there occurred a number of contested papal elections so that several claimants to the office emerged (antipopes), and it was found necessary in A. D. 1179 to stipulate that, "he shall be considered Roman pontiff who shall be elected and received by two thirds [of the cardinals]."[4] This decree remains in force today. The following account of a papal election indicates the efforts which were required to keep the cardinals from outside influences and attentive to their task.

> The conclave . . . is set apart to the cardinals for the election of the pope; and it must be shut in and walled in on all sides, so that, excepting a small wicket for entrance, which is afterwards closed, it shall remain strongly guarded. And therein

> is a small window for food to be passed in to the cardinals, at their own cost . . . . After the first three days they have but one dish of meat or fish daily, and after five days . . . bread and wine only, until they agree . . . .[5]

The pope's advisors were called cardinals, who made up the papal *curia* or court. From earliest times these had been the principal priests and deacons of Rome. During the Middle Ages the average number was about 30. They all resided in Rome until the 12th century, when Alexander III (1159 to 1181) first appointed foreign cardinals. A meeting of the pope with the cardinals for the purpose of receiving counsel and deliberating actions was called a *consistory.*

The government of the church required numerous departments within the curia, of which the chancery was the most important. Here were drafted the many documents of the papacy, and records were kept of all transactions and correspondence. In order to prevent the forgery of documents the papal chancery developed elaborate formulae for each type of document. These models were later on copied by most of the state chanceries of Europe and were the forerunners of the technical format which is characteristic of legal documents today. The chancellor affixed the papal seal *(bulla)* on the official documents, from which term the documents themselves derived the name "bull."

The popes sent *legates* or personal representatives throughout Europe to oversee the affairs of the church, and papal ambassadors were usually assigned to the courts of the leading monarchs. Even when judged by modern standards, the papal machinery of government was highly efficient.

The church possessed several means of enforcing ecclesiastical discipline. The most potent of these was the *interdict,* which excluded Christians from participation in the sacraments of the church. Interdicts, which the pope alone had authority to impose, were of several kinds: personal, local, or general. The most famous are those under which entire nations were banned from spiritual activities. Churches were closed, crosses reversed, and only the sacrament of Baptism was permitted. Marriages and burials were refused

the church's blessing. Bells were silent. Sundays were observed with meetings outside the church doors where sermons on penitence were delivered. *Excommunication,* another disciplinary measure, severed an individual from the church. In effect it excluded him from society, since no Christian was permitted to have anything to do with an excommunicate. His wife could leave him, children disobey him, and he was refused justice in the courts or physical protection. A burial service was read for him as though he had died. Both of these extraordinary measures were intended to bring individuals to a realization of their guilt for gross sins, to seek the church's pardon, and thereby be restored again to full communion.

BISHOPS

The actual day-by-day government of the church on the local level was carried on by bishops, whose jurisdiction extended throughout a territorial unit known as the *diocese.* The boundaries of these episcopal territories usually conformed to those of the old Roman provinces from the time of Diocletian (A. D. 284–305), and often to those of the Roman *civitas* or city-state. Indeed, during the period of economic decline which followed the fall of Rome it was often the presence of the bishop and his household which alone kept the towns alive. The bishop's throne *(cathedra)* gave to the church where it was located the name cathedral. An administrative staff grew up around the bishop which resembled the papal curia on a smaller scale. Priests assigned to the cathedral to assist the bishop were called canons, and by the high Middle Ages they were usually organized in a *chapter* which observed a semimonastic rule. The archdeacon was their leader, and it was a rare bishop who did not experience tension between himself and this influential official.

In the early church bishops were elected by the clergy and people of a diocese. During the 10th century the cathedral canons gained control of episcopal elections, but the king's "consent to elect" *(concessio regalis)* was required. The consecration of a bishop took place following his confirmation by the archbishop, who claimed the right to judge his suitability. The *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms (c. 1012)

stated that bishops should be "elected by the clergy, asked for by the people, and consecrated by the metropolitan (archbishop)." Popes claimed the right of intervention in all episcopal elections. With all these vested interests at stake, it is not surprising that there were numerous contested elections in the Middle Ages.

At his consecration the bishop received the symbols of his office: the pastoral staff, the ring, and (after 1100) the mitre, a shield-shaped headdress.

The bishop's primary responsibility was the supervision of all churches, monasteries, revenues, and ecclesiastical justice within the diocese. In order to do this most effectively he was required to conduct visitations to every ecclesiastical establishment under his care once every 3 years. We possess a number of records of such visitations. A typical account is that of Archbishop Odo of Rigaud in Normandy, made in February 1248:

> We found that the priest of Ruiville was ill-famed with the wife of a certain stone carver, and by her is said to have had a child; he does not stay in his church, he plays ball, and he rides around in a short coat (the garb of armed men); . . . Also, the priest of Ribeuf frequents taverns and drinks to excess . . . Simon, the priest of St. Just, is pugnacious and quarrelsome.[6]

In a large city church Odo discovered that "the canons talk and chatter from stall to stall, and across each other, while the divine office is being celebrated. They hasten through the psalms too quickly." [7] In another place the bishop discovered priests who were deficient in their knowledge of Latin verbs.

Bishops engaged in a multitude of responsibilities. They baptized, preached, heard confessions, aided the poor and oppressed, founded and supervised welfare agencies, and acted as arbitrators between individuals, cities, lords, and even kings; they maintained a court, administered the physical properties of the diocese, engaged in wide correspondence, attended church councils, advised monarchs, and occasionally wrote devotional and theological treatises. In

addition to this, bishops held land which required feudal services, such as leading knights in warfare, collecting taxes, and giving counsel.

Standing between the bishop and the pope was the archbishop or metropolitan, who was simply the bishop of an important city and whose jurisdiction included those dioceses in proximity to his own. His territory was called a province. Usually the popes exercised their authority through archbishops, who were in some cases also permanent papal legates (such as the archbishop of Canterbury).

From the 11th century all bishops and archbishops were required to make periodic visits to Rome to report on their stewardship.

THE PARISH

The basic unit of ecclesiastical organization was the parish, which was often coterminus with a manor and was served by a priest. Most parishes in the Middle Ages were rural, since towns were neither large nor numerous. The priest himself was often a son of the manor who knew intimately the people he served (and vice versa).

The parish priest was directly responsible for the spiritual welfare of the mass of Christians. He was authorized by the bishop to administer all the sacraments of the church except ordination and confirmation. Up to A. D. 1100 his education was usually shallow, derived either from another parish priest or from a monastery nearby. In the high Middle Ages his opportunities were enhanced by the growth of universities in the towns. Priests who lived in towns enjoyed a greater variety of service and chances for advancement. In the larger churches where there were many priests they often lived a semimonastic life according to a rule, usually that of St. Augustine. These priestly communities were called *collegia*, hence the churches came to be known as collegiate churches though they had nothing to do at this time with colleges in the modern sense of the word. Our contemporary term college derives from the fact that many early universities grew out of collegiate churches.

The priests who served cathedral churches as canons

and those who lived in a collegiate chapter were supported by endowments of income-producing land called *prebends.* It was a scandal of the late Middle Ages that many canons went about collecting the rights to several prebends, from which income they hired other priests called *vicars* to fulfill the parish duties which were required. The church finally enacted a regulation which stipulated that every priest must spend at least one third of each year in residence at his parish.

Unfortunately many of the records of this period reflect only the violations of canon law and Christian ethics. To reconstruct history from episcopal visitation diaries is like writing an account of society solely from police court records. Chaucer's description more accurately represents the medieval parish priest:

> A good man was ther of religioun,
> And was povre persoun of a toun;
> But riche he was of holy thoght and werk.
> He was also a lerned man, a clerk,
> That Cristes gospel trewely wolde preche;
> His parisshens devoutly wolde he teche.
> Benigne he was, and wonder diligent,
> And in adversitee ful pacient.[8]

> [A good man there was of religion
> And was a poor parson of a town
> But rich he was of holy thought and work
> He was also a learned man and clerk
> That Christ's Gospel would truly preach
> His parishioners devoutly would he teach
> Benign he was, and wonder diligent
> And in adversity full patient.]

At first the parish church was a small frame building, but after A. D. 1200 stone came into general use. The land around the church, including its cemetery, was considered sacred ground, and all acts of violence within these precincts were forbidden. From this arose the right of sanctuary, or asylum, whereby a person in danger of physical harm by another could flee to the church, hoping that his persecutor would respect the custom. Churches normally

did not have pews, and people stood for the liturgy. Church buildings also served as social centers for the parish. Children played in its cool interior, and secular business was often conducted there. Dances were held in the churchyard and many churches laid a *choraria* or dancing pavement at the main entrance. Occasionally one reads of grain being stored and animals lodged in churches. It was not a lack of reverence which prompted such use of sacred buildings but rather the consciousness that God was very close to man and was his friend. It was only in the late Middle Ages that God became more remote and His home became a place of awe, fear, and silence.

FINANCE

In addition to the gifts of the faithful, the papacy received income (called *census*) from its considerable estates in Italy. From the time of Gregory I (590–604) these holdings had continued to grow, so that by the high Middle Ages the papacy was the feudal lord of almost one third of Italy. Peter's pence was contributed annually by the Christian monarchs of England, Poland, Hungary, and Scandinavia. The popes also received fees for *exemption,* that is, the right of monasteries, churches, and religious orders to be released from the jurisdiction of bishops in order to come directly under papal authority (such as Cluny, the Premonstratensians, Cistercians, Knights Templars, and Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem). Since the pope was far away, exempt institutions usually enjoyed greater freedom than did those who came directly under the local bishop's supervision. High church officials paid fees for the confirmation of their appointments, and archbishops paid to receive the *pallium,* a circular band of white wool worn on the shoulder, which was their insignia of office. In the late Middle Ages newly consecrated bishops were required to pay the *annate,* a sum equivalent to one year's revenue from their diocese. Finally, there were fees to be paid for papal documents, charters, and the use of papal courts. In many cases the papal fees represented parallel customs in the feudal system. For instance, the annate was an extension

of the feudal *relief* wherein the heir paid a sum of money to the lord for the confirmation of his inheritance.

As capitalism accelerated during the 14th and 15th centuries, old landed institutions throughout Europe experienced a period of inflation and tight money. Popes and kings went to great lengths to secure revenues by levying extraordinary taxes. It was at this time popes introduced the practice of *provisions* and expectancies, which for a fee guaranteed a prospective officeholder the right to succeed a prelate who was still living. Reformers had legitimate cause for their criticism of a church too much preoccupied with finance. One writer satirized the system in his "Gospel According to the Marks of Silver":

> The beginning of the Gospel According to the Marks of Silver: At that time the pope said to the Romans: "When the son of man shall come to the seat of our majesty, first say to him, 'Friend, whereto art thou come?' Yet if he shall continue knocking without giving you anything, cast him out into the exterior darkness." And it chanced that a certain poor man came to the court of the Lord Pope, and cried out, saying, "Have mercy on me, at least you, dispensers of the pope, because the hand of poverty hath touched me. . . ." And they hearing it were moved with indignation and said, "Friend, keep thy poverty to thyself, to perish with thee. Go behind me, Satan, because thou savourest not of the things that are of money. . . . thou shalt not enter into the joy of thy lord till thou pay thy last farthing." . . . But later there came to the court a certain wealthy clerk, fat and thick and gross, who in the sedition had committed murder. He first gave to the dispenser, second to the treasurer, third to the cardinals. . . . The Lord Pope, hearing that his cardinals had received many gifts, was sick, nigh unto death. But the rich man sent to him a couch of gold and silver and immediately he was made whole. Then the Lord Pope called his cardinals and ministers to him and said, "Brethren, look, lest anyone deceive you with vain words. For I have given you an example: as I have grasped, so you grasp also." [9]

The lower echelons of the church had four principle sources of income: tithes, perquisites, donations, and benefices. Every Christian was expected to contribute one tenth

of his income, whether in money or in kind, to the church. This was often difficult to collect and disputes arose as to the obligation of carriage. Priests had to go about the parish and gather together whatever grain, animals, cloth, or other goods the parishioners were willing to give, and store it in the tithe-barn. On one occasion we read of a priest who was beaten when he attempted to collect the tithe, and in 1226 one was murdered. Perquisites were gifts to the priest for special pastoral services which at first were voluntary, but in time they became fixed charges. Donations, usually obits (payments of masses for the dead), were gifts to the church prompted by sincere piety, and benefices included all properties which were held by the church. Bishops and abbots often possessed considerable revenue-producing real estate.

According to canon law the parish income was to be divided four ways: to the bishop, the poor, the upkeep of the church, the support of the priest. However, since many parish churches were controlled by lay lords, the priest was often not free to determine the disposal of his income.

At first glance it would appear that churchmen lived in opulence supported by the sacrifices of the faithful, but this was hardly the case, and was certainly not true of the lower clergy. In some cases, as with tithes, it was almost impossible to collect the amount due. Furthermore, as with proprietary churches, lay lords appropriated church revenues from which they paid the priest a very small salary. When an abbot or a bishop died, the king was entitled to receive his income until a successor was elected. Often kings would prolong such vacancies. William II of England (1087 to 1100) enjoyed the income from Canterbury for 4 years. By the 12th century the tithe had become an article of trade. Laymen gained the rights to receive tithes and they sold these rights on the open market. Clergymen were also guilty of abusing the system. Some accumulated a number of church offices (called *pluralism*) and with the income thus derived hired poorly educated priests to discharge their responsibilities. Many clerics never set foot in the parishes from which they derived their support. Papal bulls and church councils which sought to correct these evils were usually ineffective; in practice, the papacy itself was among the worst offenders.

COURTS, CANON LAW, COUNCILS

Emperor Constantine I (312–337) conferred judiciary rights upon bishops when he decreed, "If anyone desires to transfer his case to the Christian law and to accept its judgement, he shall be permitted, even if the case has already been before the judge." The decision of the bishop was final. "Whatever may be settled by a sentence of bishops shall ever be held as sacred." [10]

During the period of barbarian invasions of Europe the bishop's court was often the only institution for justice available. By A. D. 1100 a very large percentage of the population came under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts and law.

The lowest church court was that of the dean, who was a priest exercising the oversight of 10 parishes, usually in an area about the size of a county. He held a monthly court *(Kalends)* which also had disciplinary and educational functions. The next highest court was that of the bishop (or the archdeacon) from which appeals could be taken to the papal court in Rome. Part of the secret of Rome's primacy in the West lay in the judicious use of courts by the popes. Ever since A. D. 343 the appellate jurisdiction of the papacy had been acknowledged, and throughout the Middle Ages thousands of litigants flocked to Rome as the court of omnicompetence. Popes also sent personal representatives, called judge-delegates, throughout Europe to hear special cases.

Ecclesiastical courts claimed jurisdiction in all cases touching persons in holy orders (priest, deacon, subdeacon, acolyte, exorcist, lector, doorkeeper), including virtually all students, crusaders, and household servants of churchmen. Cases which were heard in these courts were those involving violation of oaths (which under feudalism included all breaches of contract), orphans, widows, marital problems, physical injury to churches or clergy, and a host of infractions of moral law. On occasion churchmen insisted on transferring cases from civil to ecclesiastical courts "by reason of sin" *(ratione peccati)*, claiming that inasmuch as a sin had been committed the matter should be heard by the church. Had this logic been followed consistently there would have been little need for civil courts whatsoever.

One reason for the popularity of church courts was that they tended more toward clemency than did the civil courts. This was because the church took into account intentions, motivation, and mitigating circumstances, whereas the civil laws were more rigid. This also meant that many a cleric went free of punishment for an offense that would have brought a fine, imprisonment, or death to a layman.

The means whereby a verdict was determined varied. Usually both parties, plaintiff and defendent, began by taking a solemn oath upon the Bible or on sacred relics. In an age of profound faith, even superstition, the solemnity of the oath itself often served to bring a confession from the guilty party. The defendant, who was considered guilty until proved innocent, could "purge" himself by offering character witnesses on his behalf. After hearing the evidence, the judge, assisted by peers of the litigants (usually 12), rendered his verdict. Appeals to a higher court had to be made within 10 days. Although use of the ordeal was condemned by the church, it nevertheless found its way into the system. It took a great variety of forms, such as walking several paces carrying hot irons or retrieving stones from the bottom of a cauldron of boiling oil. If the wounds healed without infection, the party was judged innocent. One curious ordeal was throwing the defendant into a lake. Water, being pure, was said to expel impurities, so that if the man floated he was guilty, if he sank he was innocent. A common ordeal was trial by battle, or judicial combat, where the accuser and the accused fought each other, with the loser considered guilty. The theory behind all ordeals was that God would intervene directly to keep the innocent from harm. But churchmen consistently denounced ordeals. Pope Nicolas I in A. D. 867 and Stephen V in 887 declared them to be a form of blasphemy. Agobard of Lyons (d. 840) observed, "If in this life the innocent were always the victors and the guilty were vanquished . . . Herod would not have killed John, but John, Herod."[11] Ordeals were finally abolished by the Fourth Lateran Council (Canon 18) which forbade priests to participate in them.

The legal code of the church which governed litigation was called canon law. This body of law grew very gradually.

At first it included all the canons of the most important councils of the early church. To this was added the decrees of influential bishops, letters and pronouncements of popes, and important decisions of church courts. By the 12th century this mass of material had grown unwieldy, so that Gratian, a monk of Bologna, collected, refined, and published a systematic treatment of canon law. His work, *Decretum Gratiani*, became the basis for subsequent elaborations undertaken by Raymond of Penaforte in 1234 (called *Corpus iuris canonici*), Boniface VIII in 1298 *(Liber sextus)*, Clement V in 1314 *(Clementinae)*, and John XXII in 1320 *(Extravagentes)*. In 1500 this material was systematically arranged and published as the *Corpus juris canonici* which remained the official exposition of canon law until it was revised in 1917.

Church councils had served as deliberative organs of the church ever since the assembly at Jerusalem (Acts 15) in the 1st century. When the decrees of a council were accepted by the universal church, or when its delegates were considered representative of all Christendom, it was called an *ecumenical* council. The first eight such councils were held in the East but were concurred in by the West as well. Beginning with the First Lateran Council in 1123, the next nine councils to the time of the Reformation were Western affairs. They varied considerably in significance and numbers; in 1215 over 3,000 clerics of all nationalities met in Rome, but in 1245 only 140 French and English bishops met in Lyons. During the Middle Ages the theory developed that only the pope possessed the right of convening an ecumenical council, and only his ratification gave its decisions authority in the church.

One of the most important medieval councils was the Fourth Lateran Council called by Innocent III in 1215. Altogether 70 canons were enacted. Here for the first time the doctrine of transubstantiation was officially declared dogma; every Christian was required to receive the Eucharist at least once annually; dioceses were not to remain vacant more than 3 months; a lectureship in theology was ordered to be established in every cathedral school; fees for pastoral acts were forbidden; bishops were reminded of their duty to preach; ordeals were abolished; and clergy were ordered

to wear distinctive garb so as to prevent them from frequenting taverns and engaging in other undignified behavior. The council ordered archbishops to convene an annual provincial council for the correction of abuses, and official papal investigators were appointed for every diocese to insure the enforcement of moral and theological discipline.

Besides the infrequent ecumenical councils, there were annual diocesan synods and numerous meetings of prelates which did not rank as general councils.

MONASTICISM

The origins of Christian asceticism are as old as Christianity itself, but its organization along communal lines did not occur until the 4th century. Although it was essentially a unique way of worshiping God, early monasticism was also predominantly a lay movement protesting the secularization of Christianity following the conversion of Constantine. At that time it was largely confined to Egypt and Syria. Athanasius is credited with introducing communal religious life to the West when he visited Rome in A. D. 340, bringing with him two monks and his influential *Life of St. Anthony*, the "father of monks." For the next 200 years Western monasticism largely followed the Egyptian pattern, characterized by rigorous austerities, corporal punishments, a daily recitation of the entire psalter, and individualism. This brand of religious life was especially fixed among the Irish. During this time numerous rules for monks appeared in the West, although all of them generally followed the Egyptian pattern.

Typically Western monasticism was shaped primarily by Benedict of Nursia, who felt that earlier monks had gone to extremes in solitude and solo displays of extravagant piety. In A. D. 529 he founded a monastery at Monte Casino, north of Naples, and as a guide for his monks he drew up a comprehensive set of regulations known as the Rule of St. Benedict. In time monks came to be known as *regular* clergy (because they lived by the *regula* or rule) as distinct from the *secular* clergy (who lived in the *saeculum* or world).

Benedict's Rule, which he called simply, "a school for

beginners in the service of the Lord, which I hope to establish on laws not too difficult or grievous (Prologue)," had the merits of moderation coupled with flexibility, so that it was easily adaptable to many situations. For the last thousand years up to modern times this rule has formed the basis for almost all Western monastic orders. Benedict suggested that the psalter should be recited over a week's time instead of daily as before. He insisted on balanced meals, even allowing up to 1½ pints of wine daily. (They were Italian monks!) He permitted the use of heavy clothing in winter (Egyptian rules had no provisions for winter), and he forbade any ascetical practices which might be injurious to health.

During the "Benedictine centuries" (A. D. 600–1100) Europe was a society composed of cells in which the estate, village, and manor were units. The monastery was an expression of this decentralization in the ecclesiastical sphere. Each one contained everything necessary for the maintenance of life: fields, cattle, barns, craftsmen's workshops, winepresses, dormitories, library, refectory, and herb garden (for the infirmary); and dominating the entire complex was the abbey church.

The monk's day was spent performing three main duties. The "work of God" *(opus Dei)* was foremost; this involved worship in the church seven times. A total of 3½ hours was spent in communal worship. Monks received the Eucharist daily, and until the 13th century, under both kinds. The "spiritual reading" *(lectio divina)* was directed toward the spiritual growth of the monk, although in time the celebrated monastic intellectual activities developed as a result of this reading. About 4½ hours were spent in this daily occupation. Finally, Benedict required about 6½ hours of manual labor *(opus manuum)* of his monks. Most scholars are agreed that this aspect of the rule constituted a revolution in European attitudes, for it elevated the idea of manual labor as a virtue which in late Roman times had been performed mainly by slaves.

The monk's schedule varied according to the season of the year, since it was regulated by the sun and influenced by fast days and seasons of the church year. A typical monastic day in November might look something like this:

2:00 a. m. rise for Vigils (Matins)
2:15—5:00 a. m. spiritual reading
5:00 Lauds, followed by a short nap
5:30 Prime, followed by chapter
6:00—8:00 a. m. spiritual reading
8:00 a. m. Terce and Mass
9:30—12:30 manual labor
12:30 p. m. Sext, followed by sung High Mass
2:00 p. m. None, followed by dinner. (In winter there was only one meal. In summer there were two meals, at noon and 6:00 p. m.)
2:30—5:00 manual labor. In summer there was a siesta after dinner.
5:00 p. m. Vespers, followed by a snack
6:30 p. m. Compline, followed by retirement [12]

In winter the monks enjoyed 9 hours of uninterrupted sleep, but there were longer services and less work and reading. In summer they had about 7 hours of sleep, but they enjoyed a 2-hour siesta at noon.

The rule demanded of every monk a two-fold vow, that of "stability" *(stabilitas loci)*, which required of him permanent residence at the monastery of his entrance to the order, and "conversion of life" *(conversatio morum)*. In addition to this, it was understood that he would follow the three "evangelical counsels" of poverty, celibacy, and obedience to the abbot. The *chapter* of monks (all monks gathered for official business) elected the abbot for life, who was then solely responsible for the welfare of the house. He in turn chose a *prior* to be his chief assistant, in addition to a *cellarer* who was in charge of the temporal affairs of the house, and *deans*, each of whom was in charge of 10 monks. The chapter had only a negative function. It could veto a suggestion by the abbot, but it could not initiate action which the abbot opposed. By the 12th century this had changed, however, and most chapters possessed considerable powers of legislation. One reason for this was that very few abbots lived in the monastic cloister anymore. Instead, they had their own ménage but within the monastic compound.

At first all monasteries were diocesan establishments and

were under the jurisdiction of the bishop, which meant that all religious houses could expect official episcopal visitations regularly. The rule permitted bishops to interfere in monastic elections. Added to this source of potential friction was the fact that the rule permitted the *sanior pars* (more sensible group) to prevail in an election even though they might be a minority. Furthermore, abbots were also state officials since most monasteries held land from the king and owed him feudal services, so that the crown insisted on its rights in the choice of abbots. It is not surprising to find many contested abbatial elections during the Middle Ages.

When Benedict wrote his rule in A. D. 529 it was intended only for his own monastery. The rule did not become generally accepted until the Council of Aachen in A. D. 817 where Louis the Pious, son of Charlemagne, decreed that henceforth this rule alone would be permitted in the empire. This was done at the insistence of Benedict of Aniane (d. 821), an influential advisor of the emperor.

Benedictine monasticism underwent many changes during the Middle Ages through reinterpretations of the rule. Two of the most significant developments are the establishment of Cluny in A. D. 910 and of Citeaux in A. D. 1098.[13] Cluny sought to accomplish three things: (a) emphasize worship [cultic] to the virtual exclusion of reading and labor, (b) organize the monasteries into a coherent system with vertical and horizontal relationships to each other, (c) free the church and especially the papacy from the control of lay lords. During the 10th and 11th centuries the Cluniac Order represented everything that was vital and progressive in Christianity. The Cistercian Order came into being as a reaction to the secularization of the church which followed on the rise of capitalism in the 11th century. These monks sought to return to the simplicity of Benedict's Rule and to the ideals of poverty and isolation.

One of the best-known contributions of monasticism to culture is the preservation of Christian and pagan classics. The *scriptorium* became an important adjunct to the library, where monks copied and thereby perpetuated the works of Vergil, Priscian, Ovid, Donatus, Cicero, and Latin translations of the Greeks. Next to the Bible, their most

popular Christian authors included Augustine, Boethius, Origen, Jerome, and Pseudo-Dionysius.

By the high Middle Ages a distinction had arisen among monks between those who were considered *contemplatives* and the *actives*. The latter insisted that the best way to serve God was by serving one's neighbor, whereas the former emphasized prayer and worship. Much 12th-century monastic literature deals with the tensions between these two groups, the contemplatives identifying themselves with Mary, the sister of Lazarus (Luke 10:38-42), and the actives with Martha.

The monastery became a familiar feature of the medieval countryside. It employed numerous servants, was usually lord of several manors, served as a social welfare agency, experimented in agriculture and breeding, and through its schools educated most of Europe's leaders for several centuries.

THE CHURCH YEAR

Medieval society was permeated with a Christian atmosphere fostered by the liturgical cycle of festivals, fasts, and saint days. Both church and state calculated time according to the church calendar (for example, in England the king met with parliament at Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost).

The cycle began with the four Sundays in Advent which heralded the coming of Christ. Christmas was celebrated with a traditional midnight Mass, feasting in the manor hall at the expense of the lord, and folk festivities. The Christmas crèche was introduced by St. Francis of Assisi in 1223. The 12 days of Christmas included a cluster of minor festivals leading up to Epiphany on January 6. Candlemas, February 2, received its name from the traditional blessing of candles on this day, which also commemorated the purification of the Virgin Mary. Ash Wednesday marked the beginning of the Lenten fast, and was observed by the reception of ashes made from the palms of the previous year's Palm Sunday. Lent was an especially solemn season marked by fasting and other acts of self-denial. Wooden crosses replaced those of precious metal, statues were covered, priests robed in

black, and bells were hushed. Palm Sunday was marked by processions and the blessing of palms. On Maundy Thursday the church received back into communion those who had been excommunicated and flogged back from the church door those whose sentences had not been lifted. Each parish priest received the holy oils from the bishop for the coming year. Easter was observed with great jubilation, and its festive atmosphere extended to Ascension, 40 days later. The festival cycle of the year ended with Pentecost, the third major feast day (with Christmas and Easter), commemorating the coming of the Holy Ghost and the birthday of the church.

Sometime during the spring, usually about five Sundays after Easter, the priests led the faithful in procession around the fields for the annual blessing of the seed and soil. In liturgical churches this ceremony is still observed on Rogate Sunday.

Besides observing the major feasts celebrating events in Christ's life, people kept many saint days with solemnity. June 24, the day of St. John the Baptist (also Midsummer's Day) was marked with bonfires on the hillsides. Other popular festivals were Holy Cross day on September 14, St. Michael and All Angels (Michaelmas) on September 29, All Saints Day on November 1, and days associated with events in the life of the Virgin Mary. All work and secular activities were prohibited on major festivals, which tended to increase in number. A council at Oxford in 1222 mentions 55, which together with Sundays added up to 107 days on which no work was done. With the increasing secularization of society during the 13th century the number of days of obligation tended to decrease.

The observance of the church year fostered a sense of solidarity among medieval men, for they were conscious of the fact that no matter where they travelled or what their station in life, virtually every Western Christian was united in the same worship and rites on any given day. This gave meaning and reality to the concept of Christendom. "All have been made brothers, the serf and the lord, the poor and the rich, the ignorant and the learned, the humble artisan and the great lord address the one and same God and Father. Now no one denigrates another, no one despises himself as inferior to another, no one exalts himself above another." [14]

THE CHRISTIAN LEAVEN

After the downfall of the Roman Empire the church was the only institution in the West capable of filling the political and moral vacuum. It brought society under the civilizing influence of Christian ethics, it provided leaders for government, and it ameliorated the evils brought on by the conquering barbarian tribes.

The church was exclusively responsible for the care of widows, orphans, the sick, the destitute, the aged, and the poor. She cared for prisoners, ransomed captives, and taught children. All of these activities were the direct responsibility of the bishops, who according to canon law were required to spend one fourth of their revenues for charity. Following the dissolution of the monasteries as a result of the Reformation many of these welfare activities either ceased to exist or were taken over by the state.

As moral guardians of society, popes and bishops did not hesitate to employ spiritual force (notably excommunication) to bring immoral and rapacious princes to heel. Although prelates sometimes abused this prerogative in order to foster their political interests, in general they brought a beneficent influence to an age of coarseness and brutality. Three notable institutions (described below) served to mitigate the evils of feudal warfare: The Peace of God, the Truce of God, and chivalry.

The complexities of feudalism promoted private warfare, and it was usually the innocent who suffered most. Toward the end of the 10th century "a league of the friends of peace" was established by a series of church councils and supported by clergy and laity. The Council of Verdun-sur-Saône (1016) sought to encourage feudatories to take an oath, "not to attack the clergy, not to seize the peasant's ox, cow, etc. (a long list of animals follows); not to kill; not to attack travellers; and not to encourage any kind of brigandage or violence." [15] Violators of the peace were liable to the interdict. The church went further and recruited volunteers for a militia to defend the peace, which in effect supported the concept of just wars. The principle was that the strong were honor-bound to defend the weak against unjust aggression.

The Truce of God was first introduced in A. D. 1027; this forbade warfare during specified periods of time. At first it ran from the ninth hour on Saturday to the first hour on Monday. Soon it was extended to include Friday, then it covered entire periods of the church year, Advent and Lent, plus a number of feast days. Although the idea was originally promoted according to dioceses, the first three Lateran councils (1123, 1139, 1179) prescribed the truce for the entire church.

Chivalry was also instituted for the preservation of law and order. In effect it was an absorption of knighthood by the church in which the knight swore to uphold Christian ideals. His investiture was surrounded with Christian symbolism. At the Gradual in the Mass of Knighthood the celebrant blessed the sword:

> O Lord, bless this sword that your servant be a defender of churches, widows, orphans, and all those who love God against the cruelty of heretics and pagans. . . . It is for the protection of mankind that You have wished the institution of chivalry. . . . Grant that with this sword he may never strike anybody unjustly and that he defend with it all that is just and right.[16]

In actual practice, of course, few knights succeeded in living up to this ideal, but it served to hold before them a standard of moral conduct.

At no time in the history of the West was Christianity's influence so pronounced as during the age between the decline of Rome and the beginning of the Renaissance.

NOTES—CHAPTER 2

1. University of Pennsylvania Translations and Reprints Series, Vol. IV, No. 3 (Philadelphia: 1900), p. 18.
2. James W. Thompson, *Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages* (New York: Frederick Ungar Pub. Co., 1966), II 650.
3. "Decree of Pope Nicolas II," in *Medieval History: A Source Book*, ed. Donald White (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1965), p. 309.
4. "Decree of Lateran Council of 1179 Concerning Papal Elections," *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, trans. and ed. Ernest F. Henderson (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1916), p. 337.
5. Adam of Usk, "The Election and Coronation of a Pope," *The Portable Medieval Reader*, ed. James B. Ross and Mary M. McLaughlin (New York: Viking Press, 1960), p. 236.

6. Odo of Rigaud, "Episcopal Visitations," ibid., p. 79.
7. Ibid., p. 81.
8. Walter W. Skeat, ed. *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (New York: Oxford, 1844), p. 425; or see *The Student's Chaucer* (New York: Oxford, 1927), p. 425.
9. "The Gospel According to the Marks of Silver," in *Medieval History: A Source Book,* ed. Donald White, p. 491.
10. Theodosian Code I, 27, cited in Jeremiah O'Sullivan and John Burns, *Medieval Europe* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943), p. 192.
11. Quoted in Gerald Simons, *Barbarian Europe* (New York: Time-Life Books, 1968), p. 87.
12. Adapted from Dom Cuthbert Butler, *Benedictine Monachism* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1924), pp. 275 ff., esp. 281.
13. See Chs. 4 and 6 for a more detailed analysis of these orders.
14. Agobard of Lyons. *Liber adversus legem Gundovaldi.* Migne, *PL* 104, col. 114.
15. H. Daniel-Rops, *Cathedral and Crusade* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Image Books, 1963), I, 350.
16. Jeremiah O'Sullivan and John Burns, *Medieval Europe* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943), pp. 493–494.

CHAPTER 3 •

TEACHING

HEIRS OF AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO

The nature of theology from the 5th to the 11th century was primarily that of preserving the traditions of the past. During these centuries, when barbarian invaders were unsettling the West, society assumed the characteristics of a rugged frontier, and Christian thought in greater or lesser degree was more derivative than it was creative. No single individual exerted a more profound influence on the theology of these centuries than Augustine of Hippo (d. 430), through whose writings the wealth of patristic thought was transmitted to the West.

One of Augustine's most significant emphases, developed in opposition to Pelagius, had been his insistence on the sinful nature of man and his corresponding need for God's grace. During the 5th and 6th centuries a semi-Pelagian school of thought arose in opposition to Augustine's pessimistic view of man. The leaders of this movement, who for the most part came from southern Gaul, objected to the idea that man by himself was incapable of Christian faith and good works. John Cassian (d. 435), a monk from Marseilles, agreed that man was by nature inclined toward sin, but this proclivity did not involve guilt, and enough goodwill remained in fallen man to cooperate with God's grace. In the last half of the 5th century another monk, Faustus of Riez, went beyond Cassian to assert that man was saved by good works, and that grace was the reward of merit. The semi-Pelagian position was staunchly opposed by Caesarius of Arles (d. 542), who insisted on the total depravity of natural man and on the necessity for God's grace as a prior

condition for good works. The Augustinian position won a notable victory at the Council of Orange (A. D. 529) which declared:

1. Adam's fall cast all men into physical death as well as death of the soul.
2. Grace is necessary for the beginning of faith, and all of man's efforts toward believing, seeking, knocking, and asking are the result of God's grace.
3. It is false to say that man is saved by the exercise of his free will.
4. Man of himself has nothing but evil and sin.
5. Without us or with us, God produces all the good which man accomplishes.[1]

The council was anti-Pelagian, but the tenets of Cassian and his followers were only partly condemned, and the medieval church continued to hold both views of man, the Augustinian and the Pelagian, in tension.

Before his conversion to Christianity Augustine had been a disciple of Neoplatonism, the philosophical system of Plotinus (d. A. D. 269) and his followers. In matters on which Scripture was silent or ambivalent, Augustine continued to interpret his theology in Neoplatonic terms. "There is a practical rule which rarely fails the commentator on Augustine's philosophy; it is that when a source for his thought is wanting, the *Enneads* of Plotinus should be searched."[2] This influence can be seen in his understanding of the Trinity, which tended to stress God's unity at the expense of His diversity. He taught that the Second Person of the Trinity was an idea in God's mind which was spoken forth as the Word, a notion directly traceable to Plotinus. Augustine also taught that all truth was spiritual and immaterial, that is, reality was in ideas and not in things. For instance, the church on earth is but a pale reflection of the true and invisible church in the mind of God. Together with the Neoplatonists he believed in the superiority of the spirit over matter, of the soul over the body, and that it was the duty of man to transcend the earthly realm of matter to reestablish harmony with God. If indeed the medieval church can be said to have been preoccupied with heaven at the expense of earthly concerns, the attitude can be traced to Augustine.

In keeping with ancient psychology Augustine believed man was divided into body and soul. The latter was indestructible and the ruler of the body, but unlike the Neoplatonists, Augustine taught that though the body was basically good, man's will was sinful. In his famous treatise on *The City of God* he divided all people into two categories, the saved and the damned. Governments existed as a result of man's sin and in order to curb his violent nature and maintain order. This basically negative attitude toward the state influenced the church's attitude toward government in the incessant struggles between kings and popes.

The medieval church not only inherited Augustine's teaching on sin, grace, the soul, the Trinity, and government, but its understanding of the sacraments, church, ministry, salvation, Scriptural interpretation, and of practically every other aspect of theology was ultimately in debt to him. Later medieval controversies (for example, the Eucharist, predestination) arose because of ambiguities within Augustine's own writings to which each side could appeal. "Augustine . . . has had a greater influence upon the history of dogma . . . than any other writer outside the canon of Scripture . . . . His writings . . . spread like oil in the centuries to come, and his many ideas germinated and blossomed far and wide like seeds from some famed garden of Europe broadcast upon the primeval virgin prairie." [3]

LATIN TRANSMITTERS

Sharing Augustine's role as a teacher of medieval Christianity are four significant churchmen of the 6th and seventh centuries: Boethius (d. 524), Cassiodorus (d. 580), Gregory I (d. 604), and Isidore (d. 636). Because they serve as a bridge between the patristic age and the Middle Ages they are often referred to as the Latin transmitters.

The influence of Boethius on the 11th and 12th centuries is second only to that of Augustine. Practically everything these centuries knew of Aristotle came by way of Boethius' translations of his logical works, and it was Boethius who first applied Aristotelian methods to theological problems, a method which found its fruition in scholasticism. It is

ironic that his *The Consolation of Philosophy,* the favorite philosophical treatise of the Middle Ages, contains few uniquely Christian ideas, but his work on the Trinity and on the Catholic faith stamp him as a genuine Christian father. One of his primary concerns was the relation of man's free will to divine foreknowledge, which he answered by stating that God sees all things concurrently and eternally, while man is bound by his nature to see events through a succession of time.

> There seems to me . . . to be such incompatibility between the existence of God's universal foreknowledge and that of any [man's] freedom of judgment . . . . God . . . views . . . everything as though it were taking place in the present. If you would weigh the foreknowledge by which God distinguishes all things, you will more rightly hold it to be a knowledge of a never-failing constancy in the present, than a foreknowledge of the future . . . . God sees all things in His eternal present.[4]

Boethius' pupil, Cassiodorus, wrote a treatise explaining his educational program for the residents of a monastery he established at Vivarium. This work, *The Institutes on Divine and Secular Letters,* compares the growth in knowledge of Scripture to a ladder:

> . . . let us climb unhesitatingly to the Divine Scripture by means of the laudable expositions of the Fathers, as if by a certain ladder in Jacob's vision, in order that, borne aloft by their words, we may deserve to reach an effectual contemplation of the Lord.[5]

Cassiodorus insisted that a thorough grounding in secular literature must precede the study of Scripture, and he outlined the course of study required before his monks were permitted to pursue theology. This course constituted the seven liberal arts divided into the *trivium* and the *quadrivium.* The first dealt with grammar, rhetoric, and logic, which had to do with the ordering of experience and giving expression to what was known. The second comprised the four sciences of arithmetic, astronomy, geometry, and music, which focussed on the acquisition of knowledge. These liberal arts formed the basis of learning throughout the Middle Ages up to modern times.

Cassiodorus also wrote the *Tripartite History*, a compilation of three earlier histories of the church by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, which became the standard church history of the medieval period. The monastery at Vivarium was the first in the West to adopt a program of preserving classical and patristic learning, and unlike other religious communities, Cassiodorus sought out scholars and literary men to become monks. In the centuries following his death almost all the monastic houses in the West followed the example of Vivarium and became repositories of culture and education.

Gregory I (the Great) was the primary source for the medieval practices of saint worship, veneration of relics, the doctrine of purgatory, and the notion of demons and angels who intervene directly in human affairs.[6] His longest work, *Moralia in Iob*, expounds in great fullness the allegorical method of Scriptural interpretation by which theologians were enabled to draw surprising conclusions from the Bible. He also wrote four books of *Dialogues* which form a collection of miracles, visions, and prophecies. His handbook on the duties of a priest, *The Pastoral Rule*, was the basis of clerical education during most of the Middle Ages and became for the secular clergy what Benedict's Rule was for the monks. From the 8th century virtually every European monastery contained at least one of Gregory's works.

Isidore of Seville composed the *Etymologies* based on the principle that the nature of all things could be explained by a study on the origins of names. It is an encyclopedia of the knowledge of his time, including miscellaneous material on law, theology, medicine, man, the church, animals, politics, architecture, agriculture, military science, navigation, and other subjects. Since his etymological explanations, like those of ancient grammarians and rhetors, are often based only on the sound of the word, he frequently gives the most astonishing interpretations. Thus *apis* (bee) is explained as *sine pedibus* (without feet), and *amicus* (friend) is derived from *hamus* (hook). This work remained a standard book of education until the 13th century.

In addition to these Latin writers, an anonymous 6th-century Greek author exerted considerable influence on the

medieval West. Since his works were mistakenly attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite whom St. Paul converted in Athens (Acts 17:34), he has come to be known as Pseudo-Dionysius. This author aimed at a synthesis between Neoplatonism and Christianity, stressing the intimate union between God and the soul and the gradual deification of man. The relationship between God and the world was established through a hierarchy of graded beings. Pseudo-Dionysius provided the charter for Christian mysticism, and his works were studied and commented on by practically every significant Christian writer from the 12th century on.

CAROLINGIAN CONTROVERSIES

During the 2 centuries from Gregory the Great to the time of Charlemagne the Christian West, besieged by Islam on the south and preoccupied with civil wars, showed little appetite or competence for theological discussion. In most cases Baptism alone represented the maximum requirement for the name Christian, regardless of faith or life. Charlemagne's celebrated revival of learning, however, also spurred reflection on Christian dogma, and a number of doctrinal controversies marked the late 8th and early 9th centuries.

The Vandals who settled in southern Gaul and Spain after the fall of Rome followed Arianism, which denied the deity of Christ, and during the 780s the old heresy emerged again, this time promoted by Felix of Urgel and Elipandus of Toledo. It is interesting to see that they were opposed principally on the grounds of the Eucharist—the argument being that unless Christ was truly God, Holy Communion would be meaningless. Some historians maintain that the church overreacted to this heresy (also called Adoptionism) by stressing the deity of Christ to the exclusion of His humanity. This, they say, was especially evident in the Eucharist, which ceased being a fellowship meal and became surrounded with awe and mystery. Altars were removed to the very end of the sanctuary, and railings kept the faithful from coming too near the holy of holies. The Sacrament became an object of veneration instead of Communion. Alcuin, Charlemagne's principal advisor, wrote *Seven Books Against Felix,* and the

heresy was condemned by the Council of Frankfurt in 794. Apparently Felix repented of his error, and he remained in good standing but under the supervision of his archbishop.

For many years a controversy had been raging in the Eastern Church over the proper use of images in worship, and in 787 the seventh ecumenical council of Nicea declared that pictures of Christ and the saints could properly receive salutation and respectful reverence. Charlemagne was displeased that he had not been consulted, and to aggravate his displeasure a faulty Latin translation of the conciliar proceedings led him to believe that images could receive homage, adoration, and service. He had his scholars compose the *Libri Carolini* which stated the Frankish church's policy on the question:

> God alone we should worship, adore, and glorify. Of Him alone the prophet said that His name was exalted. We also owe veneration to His saints who defeated the devil and who are now reigning with Him. Bravely they fought, to transmit to us unharmed the state of the Church or, as we know, assisted the Church constantly with their contributions and interventions. The worshipping and adoration of images, however, should be entirely abolished . . . . images have hardly any function in the performance of the mystery that involves our salvation.[7]

Charlemagne's imperious attitude, although evangelically motivated, further irritated an already tense relationship between the Greek and Latin churches.

The cleavage was widened with the controversy over the origin of the Holy Spirit. The original Nicene Creed simply declared that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father, but in 589 at the Spanish council of Toledo the West had added the words, "and the Son" (Latin *filioque),* from which word the controversy takes its name. The West may have made this insertion to add dignity to the Son, in opposition to the endemic Spanish Arianism. In 809 Charlemagne approved the insertion at the Synod of Aachen, although Pope Leo III was opposed to it as being an innovation. The filioque has become the standard formula in the West, although the

Eastern Church maintains the original wording. Through the centuries the issue has been an obstacle to a reunion of the churches.

The latent ambiguities in Augustine came to the surface in a controversy over the relationship between God's foreknowledge and man's salvation. Gottschalk, a Saxon monk, insisted on a strict double predestination. That is, he maintained that those who rejected Christ were foreordained to do so, and those who were saved were likewise elected from the beginning by God. In his words:

> For just as the unchangeable God, prior to the creation of the world, by His free grace unchangeably predestined all of His elect to eternal life, so has this unchangeable God in the same way unchangeably predestined all of the rejected, who shall be condemned to death for their evil deeds on judgment day according to His justice and as they deserve.[8]

Gottschalk was condemned at a Synod of Mainz in 848 and imprisoned for the remaining 20 years of his life. Unhappily for the church, Hincmar of Rheims opposed the new heresy by inordinately stressing man's free will and the necessity for the ministrations of the priesthood as a condition for salvation. By thus elevating merit over grace he gave impetus to the old semi-Pelagian attitude which continued to influence the church.

The first significant discussion on the nature of the Eucharist took place during the 9th century. From earliest times Christians had believed that Christ's body and blood were received in Communion, but they expressed this reality in different and sometimes confusing terminology. Some theologians spoke of Christ's symbolic or sacramental presence, while others supported the view that the elements (bread and wine) actually changed into Christ's historical body. In 831 Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corbie, wrote the first monograph on the subject, *On the Body and Blood of the Lord.* He believed that Christians did in fact receive the actual body and blood of the same Jesus of Nazareth who had lived in Palestine. He further maintained that only those who spiritually comprehended Christ in the Sacrament actually received Him. Unbelievers received mere bread and wine.

Ratramnus, also a monk of Corbie, answered this treatise with his own of the same title in which he maintained that Christ was truly present but in a spiritual sense.

> Let it not be thought from my saying this that in the mystery of the Sacrament the body and blood of the Lord are not received by the faithful, for faith receives that which it believes, not that which the eye beholds. It is spiritual meat and spiritual drink. Spiritually it feeds the soul and gives life.[9]

Thus a literary controversy was opened which soon engaged the attention of most 9th century theologians, most notably John Scotus Erigena and Rabanus Maurus, who aligned themselves with Ratramnus. Hincmar of Rheims championed the opposing view. The discussions continued into the 10th and 11th centuries, culminating in the Berengar-Lanfranc controversy in which the former denounced the materialistic conception of the Sacrament. The consensus of the church, however, tended to support the realism of Radbertus. Both Ratramnus and Berengar were condemned by the Council of Vercelli in 1050, and the church was well on its way toward the definition of transubstantiation. This teaching, that the substance of the bread and wine are converted into the body and blood of Christ with only the accidents (outward appearances) of the elements remaining, was fixed as a dogma by the Lateran Council of 1215.

The most original 9th century theologian, John Scotus Erigena, went almost unnoticed by his peers. He was very much influenced by Pseudo-Dionysius, whose works he translated into Latin. According to Erigena, all of nature was a mirror of God Himself, but there was a hierarchy of perfection graded according to proximity to God: the further one was away from God, the less one participated in His light. Like Pseudo-Dionysius, Erigena placed a strong emphasis on the soul's journey upward by means of contemplation. His ideas were espoused by some later mystics, but his pantheistic and Neoplatonic notions were condemned at Vercelli in 1050 and at Paris in 1210.

The 10th century was devoid of significant theological activity as Europe was besieged by Norsemen, Magyars, and Saracens. The papacy sank to its nadir at the hands of Roman

factions. Gerbert of Aurillac, who was Pope Sylvester II from 999 to 1003, is a notable exception. He instituted reforms to purge the church of simony and concubinage, was active in promoting mission work in Hungary and Poland, and was an early proponent of the use of dialectics in theology. His revival of interest in Boethius and Aristotle had a direct bearing on the birth of scholasticism.

BEGINNINGS OF SCHOLASTICISM (1000–1200)

With the 11th century we move into a new world as compared with the previous 500 years. Europe, no longer on the defensive, began to expand and colonize. The rise of commerce undermined the feudalistic self-sufficient economy, and a newly emerging middle class populated the growing cities. Whereas in earlier centuries the monastic schools had dominated theological education, it was now the urban cathedral schools which took the lead. Between 1050 and 1200 every cathedral had a school, and in influential centers these in turn became universities. The church was also influenced by the general expansion of intellectual and cultural frontiers, and this became most evident in the growing importance of dialectic.

Earlier Fathers had maintained that reason was the handmaid of faith and that the truths of Christianity were the only legitimate objects for intellectual reflection. The 11th- and 12th-century theologians, on the other hand, often viewed the rational process as an end in itself, standing independent of the faith. The new dialectic took the form of posing a problem as a question *(quaestio)*, then arguments were presented for and against *(disputatio)*, and finally a tentative solution was proposed *(sententia)*. This, in short, is the method known as scholasticism. It was essentially the application of reason to revelation with the object of harmonizing the two. It took place within the context of the faith. The main single impetus to the growth of rational inquiry at this time was the discovery of Aristotle's works on logic and a corresponding revival of Boethian studies. (Boethius was a Roman philosopher and interpreter of Aristotle.)

The school of Chartres was the most illustrious center of

theology in the 12th century. Founded in 990 by Fulbert, a student of Gerbert, its leading masters usually permitted the authority of Scripture and the church to prevail over reason. By 1050, however, Berengar allowed no such restrictions, and as we have seen, his use of dialectic prompted him to reject the traditional interpretation of the Eucharist. Thus for the first time since the patristic age the church was beset by numerous doctrinal controversies which threatened its very unity, and for the remainder of the Middle Ages the use of logic undergirded heresy and orthodoxy alike.

There was considerable opposition to the use of dialectic. One of its most outspoken critics was Peter Damian (d. 1072) who looked upon it as "worldly, beastly, and devilish."

> That which is from the argument of the dialecticians cannot easily be adapted to the mysteries of divine power; that which has been invented for the benefit of the syllogisms . . . let it not be obstinately introduced into divine law.[10]

The school of Bec in Normandy sought to follow a middle ground between the two extremes. Anselm (d. 1109), its most illustrious son, suggested the proper use of reason in his celebrated *Proslogion*, "For I do not seek to understand that I may believe, but I believe in order to understand [*credo ut intelligam*]." [11] Stated in another way, he maintained that faith is in search of understanding *(fides quarens intellectum)*. His treatise, *Cur Deus Homo?* (Why the God-Man?) is a major document in Christian theology. Up to his time a popular conception was that man was saved because God, in Christ, had made a payment to Satan. Basing his theology on St. Paul, Anselm showed that in the Christian scheme of redemption satisfaction was owing to God, not Satan. He taught that God had created man in order to fill the vacancy left by the fallen angels, but by falling into sin himself man had thwarted God's purposes. Man was now required to satisfy God's justice either through holiness of life or by suffering eternal damnation. This situation also placed God in a dilemma. He could not simply forgive man's sin, for this would violate justice, and He could not punish man forever, for this would violate mercy and thwart his original plan. But if His original plan was thwarted, it would prove God to

be less than all-powerful. The solution lay in sending His Son as God and Man, who was able to render the satisfaction which man owed to God. Anselm elaborated a juridical satisfaction explanation of the Atonement, with the death of Christ as His most important single act. The influence of this interpretation of Christ's death on the medieval mind may be seen in the increasing use of the crucifix after the 12th century.

By 1150 almost all theologians accepted the use of dialectic in theology, but a new issue arose among the dialecticians —the problem of universals. Universals were general concepts representing the common elements belonging to things of the same species. Thus "humanity" belonged to all people, "goodness" belonged to the good angels, "brightness" to all light. The question was, do universals exist apart from their objects; that is, could there be "humanity" apart from people *(universalia ante rem)?* Or did universals exist in things *(in re)?* Or were they merely names describing the collective quality of things *(post rem)?* The question posed serious ramifications for theology. For instance, could the church exist without people, as an invisible entity in the mind of God? Was there such a thing as an evil principle existing in nature? Could God exist apart from His manifestations in nature? Those who held to the reality of universals apart from things, following Plato, were called Realists. Those who took the position that universals were merely words describing things, following Aristotle, were called Nominalists. The extremists in the latter group were inclined to believe only that which could be seen and touched. Obviously Nominalism tended to question the accepted traditions of the church, and much of the remainder of medieval theology can be interpreted as a struggle between the two extremes.

Peter Abelard (d. 1142) was undoubtedly the most brilliant 12th-century theologian. He espoused a modified form of Nominalism which led him to cast doubt upon ancient Christian formulations. He expressed his ideas on the Trinity in terms bordering on tritheism, and as to the Atonement he believed the chief value of Christ's work was to provide men with an example of holiness. His book, *Sic et Non* (Yes and No) was a compilation of contradictory statements from

the Scriptures and the Fathers on a large number of issues with a view toward arriving at the truth, a methodology which exercised a decisive influence on the scholastic method. This work, "was the first comprehensive exposition of theology as a science rather than as a meditation; it prised theology away from authority and exposed it to the scrutiny of reason."[12] Unlike Anselm, Abelard maintained that, "by doubting we come to inquire, and by inquiry we arrive at truth."[13] or expressed differently, "I know in order that I may believe *(intelligo ut credam)*." His teachings were condemned at Soissons in 1121, but he resumed his teaching career at Paris in 1136. Four years later several propositions from his writings were condemned at the Council of Sens. Although his speculation (and no doubt his personality) led him to a life of controversy, he considered himself a faithful Christian, and when he died in a Cluniac monastery, he was reconciled to the church. After his final condemnation in 1142, he wrote to his beloved, the famous Heloise:

> I will never be a philosopher, if this is to speak against St. Paul; I would not be an Aristotle, if this were to separate me from Christ . . . . I have set my building on the corner-stone on which Christ has built his Church . . . if the tempest rises, I am not shaken; if the winds rave, I am not fearful . . . . I rest upon the rock that cannot be moved.[14]

Peter Lombard (d. 1160), a student of Abelard, used his master's methods but the end product, his *Four Books of Sentences*, was more orthodox. These books dealt with God, Creation, the Incarnation and Redemption, and the sacraments. He was one of the first to fix the number of sacraments at seven in order to distinguish them from the lesser sacramentals. Like Abelard he collected conflicting quotations from the Fathers on questions of dogma and then resolved them by dialectic. The *Sentences* became the standard theological textbook of the Middle Ages, and by 1200 a commentary on them was one of the requirements for all students who wished to become masters of theology.

Carolingian theologians (Alcuin, Agobard of Lyons, Theodulph of Orleans), had opposed Arianism by stressing the divine nature of Christ. Similarly the use of dialectic

in the 12th century had produced a one-sided Christianity which stressed reason to the detriment of faith. A reaction against both of these extremes came about with a renewed interest in the human nature of Christ and in personal religious experience as contrasted with knowledge. This movement is commonly referred to as mysticism.

Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) was a guiding spirit of the 12th century. Although he counseled kings and popes, strenuously upheld orthodoxy against Abelard, and was a tireless preacher, his fame as a theologian rests on his classical expression of the new piety. Whereas others had worshiped Christ as a king and transcendent God, Bernard devoted himself to Jesus the Man in His humility, suffering, and obedience. He maintained that if the believer meditated on Christ's holiness and God's wrath, he would become aware of his sinfulness. But then as he gazed upon God's mercy, he became certain of his forgiveness, and in response he imitated the life of Christ. The goal of the mystical life was the complete surrender of the will of the individual to the will of God. Bernard placed such great emphasis on the grace of God that he became known as *Augustinus redivivus* (Augustine revived). In opposition to Abelard he wrote:

> Therefore where there is reconciliation, there is remission of sins. And what is that but justification? Whether therefore we call it reconciliation, or remission of sins, or justification, or again redemption, or liberation from the chains of the devil, by whom we were taken captive at his will, at all events by the death of the only-Begotten we obtain that we have been justified freely by His blood, . . . the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace.[15]

His philosophy, he said, was "to know Jesus and Jesus crucified." [16] and as to dialectic, "What do the apostles teach us? Not to read Plato, nor to turn and return to the subtleties of Aristotle, not always to learn in order never to reach knowledge of truth; they have taught me to live." [17] Bernard is traditionally cited as the author of the well-known hymn, "O Sacred Head, Now Wounded," which reflects his devotion to Christ's suffering and the deep emotion which it evoked.

After Clairvaux a second center of mysticism emerged

in the abbey of St. Victor at Paris. The Victorines: Hugh (d. 1141), Richard (d. 1173), and Walter (d. 1180), combined mystical speculation with their attempts to give faith a rational foundation.

13TH CENTURY

This century is the fruition of the 12th. It is the age of comprehensive doctrinal systems known as *summae theologicae.* It witnessed the emergence of great universities which developed from the cathedral schools. It saw the recovery of Aristotle, first through the tainted versions of Arab translators, then through the work of William of Moerbeke, archbishop of Corinth. It was the age which marked the zenith of cathedral building and Gothic architecture. In a sense this century was the watershed of the Middle Ages.

The church was the matrix from which the modern university developed, but from the very beginning the scholars sought freedom from the control of the episcopal chancellors. In effect a university (*studium generale* was its technical name) was simply a guild of masters and students, a *universitas magistrorum et scholarium,* organized along the same lines as trade guilds. At Paris studies were divided into four faculties, each under the jurisdiction of a dean: theology, law, medicine, and arts. Teaching was done by the *lectio* in which the text of Scripture or a Father was read, the *quaestio* which was the master's commentary on the text, and the *disputatio* in which all present discussed the thesis. Students were under the direct supervision of a master who personally followed their progress. A *collegia* referred to fraternities of students which handled matters of room and board. The baccalaureate degree, corresponding to the status of journeyman in the trade guilds, entitled a student to teach without abandoning his own studies. The master's degree (*licentia docendi*=license to teach) was conferred after the student had successfully produced his own "masterpiece" (just as in the guilds) by defending a thesis or dissertation in the presence of the assembled masters. It entitled him to become a master and to open his own school wherever he desired. The doctorate was of late origin and was honorary. Medieval

universities were centered largely around individual masters of renown rather than courses of instruction. Whereas theology tended to dominate education north of the Alps, Italian schools, especially Bologna (law) and Salerno (medicine) were oriented toward secular studies. Because students in law and medicine were usually mature men, the Italian schools were generally controlled by the students. Their oversight could be harsh. At the beginning of a term an instructor was required to place a down payment with the student officers, who would deduct fines whenever the teacher was late for lectures or slipshod in his work. Another regulation protected the master from beatings by students who had failed, a rule which apparently was found to be necessary. In Paris, where three fourths of the students were in their teens studying the arts, the masters controlled the academic policies.

The four great masterpieces of Gothic architecture were completed in the 13th century: Paris (1260), Chartres (1260), Rheims (1300), Amiens (1270). The cathedral is the embodiment of an epoch which began with the reawakening of Europe in the 11th century, when a Burgundian chronicler noted that "a white mantle of churches" covered the world. The church taught the faithful through art and architecture as well as words; a synod at Arras in 1025 urged scenes from the Bible to be represented on church walls, "for this enables illiterate people to learn what books cannot teach them." [18] The cathedral was a great stone book which taught the illiterates basic Bible stories and truths by means of sculpture and stained glass windows. It also provided the masses with an opportunity of expressing the new piety which mysticism supported—not unmixed with the incentive of human pride in outbuilding the neighboring towns with this symbol of grandeur.

THOMAS AQUINAS

The culmination of scholasticism was reached in the writings of Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), Dominican philosopher and theologian, *doctor angelicus,* self-styled "dumb ox." Although Aristotle was the most formative influence

on his thought, Thomas insisted that philosophy had its limitations. He sought to use reason to support the probabilities of Christian dogma and to refute heretics, but basically he believed that matters of faith lay outside the province of reason and beyond it.

> St. Thomas's own system is the most lasting testimony to knowledge in the service of belief. . . . It was directed to proving the truth of revelation. Indeed, the safety-valve of Thomism was his refusal to stretch reason beyond its limits: hence when two arguments seemed equally probable, there could be no final judgement by reason. It then was left as a matter of faith.[19]

A catalog of his writings would fill several pages, but those by which he is most remembered are the *Summa contra Gentiles,* designed as a handbook for missionaries containing his defense of natural theology against the Arabians, and the *Summa theologica,* the latest of his works and the capstone of medieval theology. His argument for the necessity of the sacraments provides us with a sample of his thought:

> . . . the death of Christ is, so to say, the universal cause of human salvation, and since a universal cause must be applied singly to each of its effects, it was necessary to show men some remedies through which the benefit of Christ's death could somehow be conjoined to them. It is of this sort . . . that the sacraments of the Church are said to be. Now remedies of this kind had to be handed on with some visible signs. First . . . just as He does for all things, so also for man, God provides according to his condition. Now, man's condition is such that he is brought to grasp the spiritual . . . through the senses. Therefore spiritual remedies had to be given to men under sensible signs. . . . Third, because man fell into sin by clinging unduly to visible things. Therefore, that one might not believe visible things evil of their nature, and that for this reason those clinging to them had sinned, it was fitting that through the visible things themselves the remedies of salvation be applied to men.[20]

In 1879 the papal bull, *Aeterni Patris,* required the study of Aquinas by all students of theology in the Roman Catholic Church.

Whereas Aquinas followed in the scholastic tradition,

a contemporary of his, the Franciscan theologian Bonaventure (d. 1274), represented the Augustinian and mystical strand of thought. Bonaventure, like Bernard of Clairvaux, was suspicious of the use of reason. He believed the goal of the Christian should lie in the contemplation of God and the submission of one's will to the faith of the church as received through tradition.

SKEPTICS VS. AUTHORITY

The 14th century, a period of social upheaval aggravated by the Hundred Years' War, stood in stark contrast to the 13th. Old ways were challenged, and a spirit of individualism characterized by skepticism undermined practically every institution—whether ecclesiastical, political, or economic. Significantly, not a single major cathedral dates from this time. The Avignon Captivity of the papacy reduced its prestige, and the church's incessant need for revenue further alienated the people. This critical attitude is reflected in the theology of the time.

Duns Scotus (d. 1308), Oxford theologian, led a direct attack against Aquinas when he maintained the impossibility of any relationship between faith and reason. The application of dialectic to matters of faith, even though in support of it, was to limit God. He is especially famous as the first theologian to defend the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, a teaching which had been condemned by Aquinas and Bonaventure. Scotus's devotion to the blessed mother is symptomatic of the reaction against scholasticism and a revived interest in Christ's manhood and practical holiness.

William of Occam (d. 1349) an Englishman and a Franciscan like Scotus, was the principal advocate of nominalism in the 14th century. He too opposed the realism of Aquinas, maintaining that the existence of God could neither be proved or disproved. His critical application of nominalist principles to Christian tradition led him to question many of the assumptions of the Fathers, and he placed the authority of the Bible above that of reason or church. "One who reads the Bible (if he is a believer) immediately agrees with each and every thing recorded there, because he believes that all these things are revealed by God." [21] In his *Dialogue Against Heretics* Occam wrote:

> The only truths that are to be considered Catholic and necessary to salvation are explicitly or implicitly stated in the Canon of the Bible. . . . All other truths, which neither are inserted in the Bible nor can be inferred formally and necessarily from its contents, are not to be held as Catholic, even if they are stated in the writings of the Fathers or the definitions of the Supreme Pontiffs, and even if they are believed by all the faithful. To assent to them firmly through faith, or for their sake to bind the human reason or intellect, is not necessary to salvation.[22]

Occam denied that original sin was a part of man's nature, and he affirmed that men were able of their own will to produce merit pleasing to God. The Reformers of the 16th century condemned his ideas on grace, but they approved his attitude toward Scripture as the only source of revelation. His theories were never officially condemned by the church, but there can be no doubt his ideas were at variance with 14th century orthodoxy and prepared the way for the Reformation.

SCRIPTURE

Bearing Occam's statements in mind, what was the church's attitude toward the Bible in the Middle Ages? The medieval concept of authority was considerably more flexible than that of modern man, for it included not only the canonical writings of Scripture but the commentaries of the Fathers together with the canons of the church councils. The medieval theologian viewed all of received tradition as one harmonious unit, and any contradiction between Scripture and the church's interpretation of it was inconceivable. One can say they held to a concept of *sola Scriptura,* but Scripture included church. Henry of Ghent, writing about 1275, said:

> Concerning the things of the faith the fact is that the Church and Holy Scripture agree in everything and testify to the same thing, namely to the truth of the faith, in which it is reasonable to believe both of them: Scripture on account of the authority of Christ which true reason shows as obviously residing in it; the Church on account of what is seen in it by man.[23]

Because of this attitude the books of Sentences produced during these years ranged Bible passages alongside patristic quotations as being of equal validity. It was not until the 14th century that Scripture and tradition came to be viewed separately. The crisis of authority precipitated by the Great Schism, nationalism, and skepticism found theologians aligning themselves either on the side of Scripture or tradition, but the real cleavage resulted in the Reformation two centuries later. Up until 1300 "authority in the Church . . . [was] inseparable from the authenticity of apostolic doctrine . . . . [But from the 14th century on] the voice of the Church, rather than growing from the contents of the Scriptures, is superadded to them." [24]

MYSTICS

As a result of late medieval skepticism toward traditional institutional authorities, men tended to stress individual religious experience as the surest sign of God's presence. The mysticism of the 14th and 15th centuries flourished especially in northern and western Germany, although its devotees were found throughout Europe.

Chief among these mystics was John (Master) Eckhart (d. 1327), a Dominican who spent his mature years at Cologne. He believed that the soul was the meeting place between God and creation. Every man possessed a divine spark in his soul, and God could be found by cultivating the divine spark through mortification, the imitation of Christ's sufferings, and through contemplation of the divine attributes. The goal of mystical exercises was the ecstatic experience of union with deity. The mysticism of Eckhart was largely informed by Neoplatonism with Christian overtones.

He was followed by John Tauler (d. 1361), also a Dominican, who was more orthodox in his views and believed that the mystical union with God was for the practical purpose of exercising charity and leading a self-sacrificial life. The Reformers, especially Luther, regarded his sermons highly. Henry Suso (d. 1366) was a student of Eckhart who influenced the work of Thomas a Kempis.

A late 14th-century booklet, the *Theologia deutsch*, coun-

seled poverty of spirit and abandonment to God as a means of union with God. Martin Luther supervised its first printed edition in 1518. One of the most popular devotional treatises of this period was the *Imitation of Christ* by Thomas a Kempis (d. 1471), one of the most widely distributed books in the history of Western literature.

Although theologians in the late mystical tradition were highly individualistic, they shared a common interest in fostering a personal relationship with God. They often opposed, or were indifferent to, traditional ecclesiastical structures. These, they maintained, more often hindered than helped to sustain sound Christian faith. They tended to be suspicious of human productions—institutions, society, wisdom.

THE COMMON MAN

While philosopher-theologians were speculating about God in the heady atmosphere of the schools, what was the nature of the average Christian's faith during these years?

Medieval folk piety was influenced to a large degree by stories taken from the Bible. Both testaments were mined to provide fitting subjects for art and sermonic illustrations. The lives of Christ and the apostles were most popular. In the monasteries one third of the day was devoted to the study of Scripture, and in the parish schools the Bible was often the only textbook. This does not mean that every man was an accomplished exegete, for his interest in Scripture was usually limited to the moral of a story or to its basic human interest. The Bible was so interpreted that any given text was said to have no less than four different meanings. The epistles of St. Paul and the more difficult theological sections were relatively ignored outside the schools, but the Gospels, Proverbs, Psalms, Kings, and Song of Solomon were well known and loved.

The medieval man, feeling a need for intermediaries between himself and God, centered much of his piety on the veneration of saints, whose lives vied in importance with those of Christ and the apostles. Every aspect of daily life, every diocese, province, and church came under their protection. Sailors and fishermen addressed prayers to St. Nich-

olas, St. Genevieve cured fever, St. Blaise was known to relieve toothache, St. Hubert guarded against madness, and St. Jude was the saint of last resort. Each season was under saintly protection: spring, St. Mark and St. George; summer, St. John the Baptist; autumn, St. Martin; winter, St. John the Evangelist. Each parish church was placed under the protection of a saint from whom it then derived its name. St. John's church, for instance, was considered literally to be the possession of St. John, and any violators of its precincts would be answerable directly to the saint. The martyrdoms of the saints replaced the deeds of the warriors as subjects for wandering minstrels. Modern scholars have amassed a collection of stories which include more than 25,000 saints venerated in the Middle Ages.

Beginning in the 12th century there was a special interest given to the humanity of Christ and His suffering, and to the Virgin Mary. The former was no doubt fostered in part by the theology of Anselm and Bernard, while devotion to the blessed Virgin was the ecclesiastical side of the honor being given to women in general through chivalry, although Mary had always been given high honor since the Council of Ephesus (431), which had declared her to be the mother of God.

The cult of saints fostered an intensive preoccupation with their relics. Though Augustine in the 5th century had cautioned, "Let us not treat the saints as gods; we do not wish to imitate those pagans who adore the dead," nevertheless by 787 the practice had so accelerated that a church council declared, "If any bishop from this time forward is found consecrating a temple without holy relics, he shall be deposed as a transgressor of ecclesiastical traditions." [25] The Crusades especially set off a wave of relic hunting. Pieces of bone, fingers, hair, and teeth of saints flooded the West, and magnificent reliquaries fashioned to house them were often carried in procession. Naturally authentication in most instances was impossible; nevertheless, no less an eminence than King Louis IX of France built Sainte-Chapelle to receive Christ's crown of thorns, and the first crusaders were spurred on to victory through the discovery of the lance which had pierced His side. Relics were credited with mir-

acle-working powers. Oaths were customarily taken on them much as they are solemnized with the use of a Bible in modern times.

Though saint veneration was often a veneer covering crass superstition, a carry-over from Teutonic paganism, it also served the salutary purpose of providing examples of Christian morality, fortitude, and love in action. It symbolized men's belief in the doctrine of the communion of saints and the church triumphant. While some critics of this age point to its other-worldly preoccupation, perhaps it is more accurate to say that heaven became terrestrial, with angels and saints crossing freely back and forth. This world view, so alien to modern man, was not without its benefits.

Veneration of saints led to another medieval phenomenon, the pilgrimage. Shrines of saints were everywhere, and it was a rare person who had not taken the pilgrim's staff in hand at least once in his lifetime. The three most popular attractions were Jerusalem, Rome, and Compostella in northern Spain, but there were others. The tomb of St. Thomas à Becket at Canterbury, the shrine of the Magi at Cologne, the tomb of Martin of Tours, and the sanctuary of the archangel at Mont St. Michel all attracted thousands of visitors each year. Pilgrimages were a leveling force in society, as serfs jostled with princes, bishops with laymen, craftsmen with laborers, with no preference given to status. They also served to relieve the tedium of a rustic existence by providing the stimulation which travel brings, and a pilgrim who returned to his German farm after having traveled to Jerusalem was never quite the same again.

The Christian life was sustained through the use of the sacraments. Their number remained flexible during most of the Middle Ages, since there was no official definition of the nature of a sacrament. Hugh of St. Victor enumerated as many as 30. Peter Lombard listed the seven which have become traditional, although the church did not officially agree to this until the Council of Florence in 1439.

Baptism was conferred upon the newborn child. Under Charlemagne the baptistry gave way to the font, and baptism by immersion was replaced by pouring. The rite was accompanied by the use of symbols—the candle, white gown, salt,

and oil. When the child grew to adolescence he repeated the act of faith which his godparents had spoken for him. This was *Confirmation,* which was from early times reserved for the bishop or his representative. *Holy Orders* (ordination) was the rite by which a man entered the office of the priesthood. The path led through a series of suborders, culminating in the diaconate and finally the priesthood itself. Only a bishop could ordain. *Matrimony* was the sacrament by which the church elevated and hallowed the marriage bond. Despite the dignity which was attached to this sacrament by the church, recent studies have shown that there were more common-law liasons in the Middle Ages than properly ratified marriages, especially among the lower classes. At the hour of death the church fortified the faithful with the sacrament of *Extreme Unction,* accompanied by prayers and litanies for the departing soul. These five sacraments were nonrepeatable, but the remaining two, *Penance* and the *Eucharist,* were to be used continuously to sustain Christian life and faith.

Penance was the most popular sacrament, consisting of private confession to a priest who pronounced the absolution and enjoined an act of piety which allowed the penitent to prove his remorse over his sin. Many times the penitent failed to understand the act of penance in this light and considered it reparation for sin, an abuse which tended to obscure the Augustinian teaching of grace and encouraged the semi-Pelagianism which was endemic in popular thinking.

The *Eucharist,* wherein the communicant received Christ's body and blood, was most often understood in grossly materialistic terms. This interpretation led to a fear of the sacrament and in turn to its infrequent reception. Coupled with this tendency went the emphasis on the Eucharist as a sacrifice (to the exclusion of Communion), and the liturgy became a drama enacted by the priest instead of a channel of grace for the faithful. By the 13th century infrequent Communion was so widespread as to call forth a decree of the Lateran Council of 1215 making at least an annual Communion obligatory for every Christian. The custom of receiving the Sacrament under both kinds (bread and wine) by all the communicants was general until the 12th century, but by 1300 the wine was usually taken only

by the celebrating priest. The use of the unleavened host instead of bread is usually attributed to Charlemagne. The Corpus Christi festival instituted in 1246 accelerated the custom of adoring the host, either as it was carried in procession or displayed in the monstrance on the altar. The mystics of the late Middle Ages, stressing personal communion with God as they did, revived the concept of the Eucharist as Communion.

Charlemagne decreed that the Roman liturgy be used throughout his empire, although variations were permitted in different localities. The order of worship remained relatively unchanged in its main outline, but there were modifications reflecting shifts in theological emphasis. St. Louis began the custom of genuflecting during the *et incarnatus* of the Creed, and the elevation of the host was added as a protest against Berengarius' denial of the Real Presence. Vestments, chants, and ceremonial all varied in time and place. The stations of the cross were added by the Franciscans, and the rosary was an innovation of the Dominicans.

The Sunday Mass was the main act of corporate worship in which the people found spiritual edification, but occasionally the behavior of priest and people was less than exemplary. Cats, dogs, and hawks were taken into churches, and numerous sermons are extant which admonish the hearers to cease chattering and listen.

The liturgy was drama, and it gave rise to dramatic art. An extension of the liturgy was the mystery play, a dramatization of an event from the Bible—perhaps an incident from the life of Christ or a missionary journey of Paul. From these dramas there developed the morality play in which abstract virtues and vices were personified and made into living characters. The miracle play depicted the life of a saint or other post-Biblical character. All of these served to teach virtue in an entertaining way.

A revival of preaching occurred during the 12th century, encouraged in part by the evangelical example of Saint Bernard. Collections of sermons were made for those priests who were deficient in the art. Honorius of Autun (d. 1130) maintained that preaching was the primary responsibility of the priest but that the sermon should not be too long; it

must entertain as well as edify, and it must avoid rhetoric which detracts from its contents. A modern commentator describes the typical medieval homily:

> The style was animated, familiar, uninhibited, and sometimes little more than trivial or clownish; for in order to stimulate the interest of his hearers, a speaker would not hesitate to throw in such pieces of news, or mere gossip, as he had picked up in the course of his travels. He might announce the capture of Jerusalem . . . or inform his congregation that a cow had dropped four calves! And if he were the parish priest addressing his own flock, he would not gloss over petty scandals or even grave ones. . . . A sermon was a kind of melodrama at which the audience wept or laughed or . . . interrupted. If the speaker introduced some unfamiliar theme, he was stopped and questioned.[26]

Thousands of hymns are extant from the Middle Ages.[27] Honorius of Autun urged that every service begin with *Veni Creator Spiritus* ("Come Holy Ghost"). One of the most loved of all medieval hymns was the *Stabat Mater Dolorosa* dedicated to the Virgin Mary. From the 11th century comes "Kyrie, O Christ Our King," and Venetius Fortunatus's "The Royal Banners Forward Go" is a 6th-century Good Friday favorite. Rabanus Maurus composed the solemn dirge, "Day of Wrath, Day of Mourning."

Superstition, ignorance, and abuses existed, yet from birth to death the medieval man lived in the conviction that in some way his life was tending toward union with God because of Christ. He was supported in his belief by the ministrations of the church, and though his life was hard and often miserable according to modern standards, he could find serenity and stability in the practice of his faith.

NOTES—CHAPTER 3

1. Council of Orange, A. D. 529 *Sacrorum Counciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, ed. Mansi (Florence: 1762), "Concilium Arausicanum" II, 711–724.
2. David Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (Longmans, Green, and Co. Ltd., London, 1962), p. 43.
3. Ibid., pp. 32, 50.

4. Boethius, *The Consolation of Philosophy* V, in Colman Barry, *Readings in Church History* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1960), I, 199 and 203.
5. Cassiodorus, *An Introduction to Divine and Human Readings*, trans. Leslie W. Jones, Barry, p. 205.
6. On the role of Gregory the Great, see Ch. 1, pp. 13-16.
7. *Libri Carolini*, II, 21, in *The Era of Charlemagne*, eds. S. C. Easton and H. Wieruszowski (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Anvil, 1961), p. 164.
8. Migne, *PL* 121, col. 368A, trans. Bengt Hägglund, *History of Theology* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), p. 153.
9. Ratramnus, *On the Body and Blood of the Lord* 101, Migne, *PL* 121, col. 170.
10. Peter Damian, in Gordon Leff, *Medieval Thought: St. Augustine to Ockham* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1958; Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1959), p. 96.
11. Anselm, *Proslogion* I, in Barry, p. 358.
12. Leff, p. 112.
13. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, Migne *PL* 178, col. 1350, in Bainton, *The Medieval Church* (New York: D. van Nostrand Co., Anvil, 1962), p. 130.
14. Abelard, *Letter to Heloise* 2, Migne *PL* 178, col. 980, in Knowles, p. 123.
15. Bernard, Ep. 190, Migne *PL* 182, col. 1069. Trans. by author.
16. Bernard, Migne *PL* 183, 995, in Leff, p. 135.
17. Bernard, Migne *PL* 183, 647, in Leff, p. 135.
18. Cited by H. Daniel-Rops, *Cathedral and Crusade* (Garden City, N. Y.: Image Books, 1963) II, 96.
19. Leff, p. 212.
20. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles* 1, 3, 5, trans. Robert Ferm, *Readings in the History of Christian Thought* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964), pp. 466–467.
21. William of Occam, *Collectorium*, III, dist. 24, qu. unica, G; as stated by Biel in Hägglund, p. 199.
22. William of Occam, *Dialogue against Heretics* 2:2; in George H. Tavard, "Holy Church or Holy Writ: A Dilemma of the Fourteenth Century," *Church History* XXIII (September 1954), 203.
23. Henry of Ghent, *Commentary on the Sentences*, n. 4.
24. Tavard, pp. 195–196.
25. *Barbarian Europe*, Gerald Simons and the eds. of Time-Life Books. (New York: Time-Life Books, 1968), p. 90.
26. Daniel Rops, I, 65–66.
27. The standard collection is the *Analecta Hymnia Medii Aevi* (Leipzig: 1915) in 55 volumes.

CHAPTER 4 •

CHURCH AND STATE

BACKGROUND

The possibility of tension between church and state was inherent in the very nature of Christianity. The followers of Christ were encouraged to separate themselves from the world while they lived in the world. In the early centuries the church developed its own structure of government, which stood apart from but yet was based on the Roman political system, and church laws were sometimes at variance with those of the state. The persecuted church believed that God ought to be obeyed rather than man, although St. Paul's warning, "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities (Romans 13:1)," was generally respected by the early church.

The conversion of Constantine (312) dramatically altered the situation. Because of imperial patronage and support the church's position was reversed, and from a persecuted minority it changed rapidly to a dominant majority in society. In 392 Emperor Theodosius declared Christianity the only legal religion in the empire. The church's success during the 4th century sharpened the debate between churchmen and secular rulers over their respective roles in society. The church in the East tended to acquiesce in imperial domination, whereas churchmen in the West either held to a strict separation of the two institutions, or in some cases believed the church should dominate the state. The theocratic idea in the West was accelerated by the removal of the imperial capital to Constantinople in 330, leaving no effective check on ecclesiastical pretensions to power. But the removal accelerated the growth of caesaropapism in the Eastern Church.

The medieval struggle between the popes and kings was more than a conflict of personal ambition. It was an attempt to reconcile the spiritual claims of the church with the temporal—the doctrine of redemption with that of creation. Both parties in the struggle relied heavily on Biblical material to buttress their position. Those who contended for a strict separation of church and state relied on such passages as, "Render to Caesar things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Luke 20:25), and reminded their opponents that Christ Himself had said that His kingdom was not of this world (John 18:36). Most important for the development of the papacy were Christ's words to Peter, "You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the powers of death shall not prevail against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven . . ." (Matthew 16: 18-19 RSV). Although medieval writers unanimously agreed that the powers Christ conferred on Peter were transmitted to the popes, they disagreed about the nature of these powers and their role in temporal government. From the 11th century on the "two swords" theory was popular on both sides. Derived from Luke 22:38, "Look, Lord, here are two swords," and He said to them, "It is enough," the controversialists used this slender basis for supporting either a separation of powers or the primacy of one over the other.

PAPAL THEORY

The popes contended that the secular order was inferior to the spiritual and must therefore be ruled by it. Following the thought of Augustine, almost all the papal theorists believed in the essentially negative role of government. That is, earthly rulers were established primarily to curb the results of man's sinful nature, to punish evildoers, and to maintain order. Since the existence of the state was a consequence of sin, it followed that the state was inferior to the church, which was God's dispenser of forgiveness on earth, Pope Gelasius I clearly enunciated this relationship (494):

> There are indeed, most august Emperor, two powers by which this world is chiefly ruled: the sacred authority of the Popes

> and of the royal power. Of these the priestly power is much more important, because it has to render account for the kings of men themselves at the Divine tribunal.[1]

This same pope, however, also maintained a separation of the two powers. He pointed to Melchisedek (Gen. 14:18) as a symbol of the union of the powers of kings and priests. Since Christ was "the new Melchisedek," He also united priestly and royal powers in Himself. After the Ascension the two powers were to be separated, "that the humility of each order would be preserved, neither being exalted by the subservience of the other, and each profession would be especially fitted for its appropriate function." [2]

Isidore of Seville (d. 636) taught that Christ gave the rulership to kings in order to guard the church. The king's function was to assist the church and its leaders in the maintenance of justice. It was naturally up to the churchmen to determine the nature of justice since this involved an ethical dimension, and the king was to carry out the wishes of the church as its auxiliary.

Pope Gregory I (d. 604) was responsible for introducing a theory which gained considerable popularity in the Middle Ages. He believed that terrestrial society was modelled on a celestial pattern. Just as heaven followed a hierarchical order with God at the apex, so also the earth was to be governed by God's vicar, the pope, at the top. It was God's will that the higher should always rule over the lower. To rebel against this rule brought nothing but sin and chaos. Other theorists supported papal primacy on the dualistic conception of man consisting of body and soul. The soul, it was held, being that which is spiritual, was naturally superior to the body. Therefore the popes and priests who were concerned with matters of the soul were considered superior to kings who dealt only with the physical. The sacrament of ordination which conferred special powers on the priesthood to celebrate the Eucharist and thereby bring God to earth also tended to set apart the clergy from the laity.

One of the most influential documents supporting papal claims in the Middle Ages was the forged Donation of Constantine. It was fabricated in the Frankish empire sometime

during the 8th century in order to support the claims of the church against the state, and in particular to strengthen the position of the pope. In it Emperor Constantine purported to give to Pope Sylvester I the rulership over all of Italy and the West, in addition to Antioch, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem. The emperor also decreed:

> . . . those most reverend men, the clergy of various orders serving the same most holy Roman Church, shall have that eminence, distinction, power, and precedence, with which our illustrious senate is gloriously adorned. . . . We have perceived that our empire and the power of our government should be transferred and removed to the regions of the East and that a city should be built in our name in the best place in the province of Byzantium and our empire there established; for it is not right that an earthly emperor should have authority there, where the rule of priests and the head of the Christian religion have been established by the Emperor of heaven. . . .[3]

Lorenzo Valla (d. 1457) is credited with proving this document a forgery.

A second influential collection of documents, falsely attributed to Isidore of Seville, comes from the 9th century and contains 60 forged decretals plus more than 100 falsified papal letters. The general tenor of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals is calculated to support the clergy over the laity, ecclesiastical freedom from lay jurisdiction, and the primacy of the pope within the church.

It is significant that the authors of these famous forgeries did not invent a new ideology of papal primacy. They simply gave support to theories which were already current, and the popularity of the views they set forth was due to the receptiveness of the soil.

KINGSHIP IN THE WEST

Opposed to the concept of papal-clerical superiority was that of royal theocracy, the idea that kings derived their authority directly from God without the mediation of the pope. The origins of this veneration of the sovereign prince

derive from ancient conceptions of divine kingship, from Germanic tribal ideas, and especially from Biblical precedent (the examples of David, Solomon, and St. Paul's letter to the Romans were often cited). The king was considered sacred, and royal consecration was included among the sacraments in the early Middle Ages. Kings were said to possess miracle-working powers. They typified Christ, and just as He ruled in heaven, kings claimed the right to rule on earth. "Our kings and emperors . . . take the place of the highest lord in this earthly life and rightly stand before all other pastors."[4]

Supporters of royal supremacy also used the Christological argument, as did the papalists, but they turned it around. They agreed that "Christ was both king and priest, but the king in Him was the higher; the Church is the Bride . . . of Christ" as king, not as priest.[5] Hugh of Fleury, an early 12th-century cleric, wrote: "Within the boundaries of his land the king seems to take the place of God the Father, and the bishops that of Christ," and he continues by suggesting that bishops should be subordinate to the king as the Son is to the Father.[6] One of the clearest statements of the royalist position comes from an anonymous writer of York (c. 1100):

> [The king] is not to be called a layman, for he is the anointed of the Lord, a god through grace, the supreme ruler, supreme shepherd, master, defender, and instructor of holy church, lord over his brothers, worthy to be adored by all men, chief and highest prelate. It is not to be said that he is inferior to the bishop because the bishop consecrates him, for it often happens that lesser men consecrate a greater, inferiors their superior, as when the cardinals consecrate a pope or suffragan bishops a metropolitan. This can be so because they are not the authors of the consecration but ministers. God makes the sacrament [of consecration] efficacious; they administer it.[7]

So long as large segments of the West remained outside of Christianity, the inevitable conflict between these opposing ideologies was postponed. By the 11th century, however, Christian evangelism had succeeded to the point where Europe was practically synonymous with Christendom in the

West. The Holy Roman emperors claimed jurisdiction over the same territory and people as did the popes, and the stage was set for a gigantic struggle which ultimately affected every Western institution. At the heart of the conflict lay the concept of the unity of society—". . . the church is one body and so it shall have only one head or it will be a monster." [8] The problem lay in identifying that one ruler.

THE CAROLINGIANS

Clovis and his descendants, known to history as the Merovingians, ruled in Gaul and the surrounding territories from 481 to 751. During the last century of their reign, the government was largely in the hands of the mayors of the palace, royal officials who maintained order for the incompetent kings. In 751 Pepin, the last mayor of the palace, asked the pope a famous question. Who should rule, the man who has the right but is incompetent, or the man who actually has the power? "Pope Zachary replied to Pepin that it was better for the man who had power to be called king . . . and he commanded by apostolic authority that Pepin should become king." [9] The last Merovingian was summarily deposed, Pepin was crowned and anointed by Archbishop Boniface, apostle to the Germans, and 3 years later Pope Stephen III personally repeated the coronation. In this way the Carolingian dynasty came to power, but the precedent for papal permission and consecration had been established; this was to influence subsequent church-state relations for centuries.

In 756 Pepin conquered a large area of central Italy from the Lombards and bequeathed it to the papacy—the gift known as the Donation of Pepin, which greatly enhanced the pope's position as a temporal ruler. Many scholars maintain that the Donation of Constantine was forged at this time in order to provide a precedent of legality for Pepin's otherwise presumptuous action.

In 768 Pepin's son Charles (Charlemagne), succeeded him as king of the Franks. Charlemagne is perhaps the best example of royal theocracy available to us from the Middle Ages. He supervised practically every aspect of ecclesiastical

life with special attention to the reform of the Frankish church. He personally convened no less than 33 church councils. All elections of bishops were conducted canonically by the clergy and people of the dioceses—but always in the presence of the king's representative. He directed the clergy to wear distinctive dress to set them apart in society, thus making it difficult for them to violate decorum under the cloak of anonymity. In church architecture he encouraged the use of baptismal fonts instead of baptistries, and he fostered the use of Gregorian chant in the liturgy.

Charlemagne also claimed supreme authority in matters of Christian dogma, and at the Council of Frankfurt in 794 he issued the *Libri Carolini* which rejected the Byzantine church's position on the use of images in worship. The decrees that were most far-reaching had to do with education, in which he established that every parish was to provide a school for all of the children of the church regardless of class, "not only children of servile condition but also sons of free men." [10] In 802 he declared that:

> . . . we, together with our faithful [men], have considered it to be useful that the bishoprics and monasteries entrusted by the favor of Christ to our control, in addition to the order of monastic life and the intercourse of holy religion, in the culture of letters also ought to be zealous in teaching those who by the gift of God are able to learn, according to the capacity of each individual.[11]

This legislation was primarily for the education of the clergy. Charlemagne also standardized the text of the Apostles' Creed, made the Vulgate (Jerome's 5th-century Latin version) the official translation of the Bible, established 21 archbishoprics in the kingdom, and promoted the use of the Benedictine Rule in all monasteries. Most churchmen acquiesced in the strong initiative taken by their ruler, as Agobard of Lyons wrote, "would to God that all men were governed by one law administered by one very holy king." [12]

Charlemagne's attitude toward the papacy is reflected in a somewhat patronizing letter he wrote to Leo III in 796:

> It is our task with divine help to shield everywhere with our arms the Holy Church of Christ from all her enemies abroad, from the incursions of the heathen and the devastations of the infidel, and to fortify her from within by the profession of the Catholic faith. It is your task, Holy Father, to assist the success of our arms with your hands raised in prayer to God like Moses so that by your intervention, God willing and granting, the Christian people will for ever achieve victory over the enemies of His name, and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ will be glorified throughout the world.[13]

The revival of letters which has become known as the Carolingian renaissance was due not only to Charlemagne's forceful personality but also to the men who surrounded him, notably the educator, Alcuin of York; the biographer, Einhard; the theologian, Theodulph of Orleans; and the historian, Paul the Deacon.

On Christmas Day in 800 there occurred in St. Peter's basilica in Rome an event which was to have profound repercussions in Christendom. A contemporary chronicler describes the action:

> On that very holy day of the nativity of the Lord when the king [Charlemagne] at Mass before the tomb of the blessed apostle Peter arose from prayer, Pope Leo placed on his head a crown and all the Roman people cried out, 'To Charles Augustus, crowned by God, great and peace-giving emperor of the Romans, life and victory.' And after the laudation he was adored by the pope in the same manner of the ancient princes and the title of Patrician being set aside, he was called emperor and Augustus.[14]

Since 476 the West had acknowledged only one emperor, the one in Constantinople. But in 754 his representative in the West was ousted by the Lombards and his territory was given to the pope in the Donation of Pepin. Now in 800 a woman (Irene), sat on the Eastern throne, one whom the West declared to be a tyrant and a usurper. Although the meaning of Charlemagne's coronation has been sharply debated practically from the moment it occurred, these observations can be made:

1. His coronation continued and strengthened the concept of the Roman empire. Medieval men did not believe the empire had "fallen." They tended to identify the empire with the fourth kingdom in the vision of Daniel (Dan. 2:40-45), and being convinced that after the fall of Rome the world would end, they attempted to postpone such a catastrophe by prolonging the concept of the Roman empire. The institution continued, at least in name, until Napoleon declared it a fiction in 1806.
2. His coronation strengthened the concept of unity in Western Christianity. There was now an office superior to that of any king, and its authority was derived from God. At the same time all the antipapal political forces found their embodiment in this office, and the popes were faced with a powerful rival.
3. The coronation in effect repudiated the authority of the Eastern emperors, which intensified the tensions between East and West.
4. The fact that it was the pope who crowned the emperor was used to prove the superiority of popes over kings. Charlemagne's biographer notes that the emperor was not pleased with this aspect of his coronation. "He was so much opposed to this at first that he said he would not have entered the church that day had he been able to foresee the pope's intention, although it was a great feast day."[15] Some years later Charlemagne had his son and successor, Louis the Pious, crown himself by taking the crown from the altar.

Following the death of Charlemagne the empire rapidly disintegrated. Rivalry among the claimants to the throne resulted in civil wars, and the situation was further aggravated by a dearth of strong personalities. Men with such characteristic names as Louis the Pious, Charles the Simple, Charles the Fat, Louis the Child, and Louis the Stammerer made futile attempts to regain imperial stability. At Verdun in 843 the empire was divided into three areas, from which partition many historians date the beginnings of modern France, Germany, and Italy. Yet the concept of empire remained, awaiting only the circumstances and personality to revive its ancient glory.

During these years (800–1000) Europe was ravaged by invasions from the north, east, and south. In 846 Norse-

men from Scandinavia sacked Paris, and not long afterward they swept around the Iberian peninsula into the Mediterranean, establishing a kingdom in Sicily and Naples which was to last a thousand years. Other Norsemen ravaged Britain, and a famous expedition of "vikings" under Leif Erickson even ventured to the coasts of North America. In 911 a large area of France was given to the invaders; it retains the name Normandy. The Magyars from the East threatened to overrun Austria until they were defeated in 955 and settled down to create the foundations of modern Hungary. The Saracens who had overrun North Africa and Spain during the 7th and 8th centuries still menaced Mediterranean commerce. They occupied all of southern Italy until the Norse dislodged them in the 10th century, and they remained in Spain until 1493.

During these troublous times neither kings nor popes were in a position to assert themselves. The papacy became a pawn of warring factions of Roman nobility, and kings were unable to arrest the acceleration of feudalism by which their vassals increased in power at the expense of royal authority. The Carolingian dynasty came to an inglorious end in Germany in 911 and in France in 987.

One exception to this melancholy chapter in papal history was Nicolas I (858–867), an energetic and high-minded pope who believed that the Roman church was the epitome of all Christendom, East and West. From this point of view it was logical for him to intervene in a disputed election of the Eastern patriarch, and in the West he reduced the independence of bishops by placing them more firmly under his own control. On the basis of his pastoral authority the pope denounced the divorce and remarriage of King Lothair of Lorraine and succeeded in persuading the prince to take back his lawful wife. This incident prompted considerable literary activity over the jurisdictional limitations of papal and royal power.

INVESTITURE CONTROVERSY

The Carolingian dynasty in Germany was succeeded by a line of rulers stemming from Saxony, who governed from

911 to 1024. The most illustrious representative of this family, Otto I (936–973, "The Great") succeeded in defeating the Magyars and in imposing a centralized government on the several duchies which constituted Germany. In 962 he invaded Italy in order to defend Pope John XII against a military coalition, and in return the pope crowned Otto emperor, thus again giving reality to the theory of empire which had lain dormant for some years. Shortly thereafter Otto deposed the pope and had one of his own choosing elected. The newly crowned emperor also revived Charlemagne's attitude toward the church by claiming to be society's supreme protector, with the pope's primary responsibility limited to the discharge of spiritual duties and support of the emperor.

This royal theocratic attitude continued under the next dynasty, that of the Salian-Franconians, who ruled in Germany 1024–1125. In 1046 King Henry III, a deeply religious ruler, called a church council which deposed the pope for simony. The next five popes were all from Germany and were elected under the tutelage of the emperor. This imperial patronage was a blessing for the papacy in that it removed the holy office from the control of warring Roman factions and placed men of high caliber and integrity in Peter's chair. But the blessing was clouded by the loss of papal independence even in matters which were primarily spiritual. By the 11th century almost every important church was an imperial church, and most bishops were imperial appointees who owed their position to the emperor's favor. The proprietary church system, whereby a lay lord controlled the revenues and life of a church on his land, was everywhere the rule. In 1050 there were 77 dioceses in France, of which the king controlled 25, and "the rest were in the hands of dukes, counts or viscounts."[16] Under these circumstances it was impossible for churchmen to discharge their responsibilities conscientiously. Indeed, many leading prelates took their secular duties as counts or royal administrators far more seriously than they did their spiritual functions.

Henry III died in 1056, and he was succeeded by his infant son, Henry IV. During the minority of this king a radical change in attitude toward the imperial authority

appeared among a group of reformers who advised the last German pope, Leo IX (1049–1054). They questioned the propriety and the right of any lay ruler, particularly the emperor, to exercise influence in clerical appointments. Humbert of Silva Candida was a forceful proponent of ecclesiastical freedom:

> According to the decrees of the holy fathers anyone who is consecrated as a bishop is first to be elected by the clergy, then requested by the people, and finally consecrated by the bishops of the province with the approval of the metropolitan [archbishop] . . . . Any prince who seeks to attain felicity on earth and to prepare himself for beatitude in the life to come . . . should not treat the priests of Christ differently than did the great Constantine . . . . Just as the soul excels the body and commands it, so too the priestly dignity excels the royal.[17]

Peter Damian, another reformer, stressed the separation of priesthood and kingship. "Each in turn needs the services of the other. The priesthood is defended by the royal protection while the kingship is sustained by the . . . priestly office," but he warned the king that, "when a king resists the divine commands it is right that his subjects despise him."[18] In 1059 Pope Nicolas II issued the famous election decree (cf. ch. 2) which declared that henceforth popes should be elected by the college of cardinals, thus effectively excluding lay and imperial influence. In the same year he concluded an alliance with the Normans of southern Italy, an act of defiance against the emperor whose predecessors had for three centuries served as Rome's "defenders."

The issue between church and state came to a head during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073–1085), also known as Hildebrand. The real problem was jurisdictional. Who had the right to appoint the hierarchy? And who selected the emperors? What was the proper relationship between spiritual and temporal powers? The act by which a vassal received his land or office from his lord was called *investiture*. When kings and princes conferred the temporalities (lands and buildings) on bishops, they also gave them the rights of spiritual office by means of the ring and pastoral staff. The pope questioned the right of laymen to influence

clerical appointments, especially the practice of laymen bestowing spiritual authority on bishops, and the dispute has become known to history as the investiture controversy.

Gregory launched his attack against lay investiture in 1075. "We decree that no one of the clergy shall receive the investiture of a bishopric or abbey or church from the hand of an emperor or king or of any lay person, male or female." [19] The penalty for ignoring this decree was automatic excommunication. In the same year the pope wrote an aide-memoir for his private use, which was not intended to be seen by others. But it got out somehow. The document, *Dictatus Papae,* made extravagant claims for papal primacy, including the first explicit claim that a pope could depose an emperor. King Henry IV in Germany (not yet crowned emperor) ignored the papal decree on lay investiture and appointed a bishop for Milan. After being admonished for this by Gregory, the king summoned a council of German bishops which denounced the pope and refused to recognize him as legitimate. Their letter to Hildebrand addressed him as "not pope but false monk," and the king declared, "I am to be judged by God alone and am not to be deposed for any crime unless—may it never happen—I should deviate from the faith." [20] Gregory responded by deposing the king from office and excommunicating him. This act released all of Henry's subjects from their oath of allegiance to him. The turbulent princes of Germany who were never happy under a strong king used this occasion as a legitimate excuse for revolt, and Henry was forced to agree that a council be held in Augsburg during February of 1077 to determine his future role in Germany.

In January 1077 the pope, en route to the Augsburg council, was resting at the castle of Canossa in northern Italy when the most dramatic episode of the controversy occurred. King Henry appeared outside the castle as a penitent, begging the pope's pardon. Gregory was now on the defensive. As chief pastor of Christendom he could not refuse absolution to a penitent sinner, even though the king's display of sorrow may have been motivated by shrewd politics. The pope absolved him, but the deposition from office remained in force.

After Canossa many of Henry's vassals again supported him, but his enemies elected a new king, Rudolph of Swabia. Germany was ravaged by civil war while the pope took 3 years to decide between the claimants to the throne. In 1080 he declared in favor of Rudolph and repeated the excommunication against Henry, but this time it had little effect in Germany. Rudolph was defeated and killed, and Henry summoned a council of German bishops which elected a counter-pope, Guibert (Clement III). The German armies marched to Rome and besieged it for 3 years.

Finally in 1084 the imperial troops succeeded in breaking through to St. Peter's and they consecrated Guibert as pope. Meanwhile, Gregory summoned his erstwhile Norman allies from southern Italy. Under the leadership of Robert Guiscard they marched on Rome, but the imperial troops had already fled, so the Norman "defenders" looted the city, razed it by fire, and withdrew to the south with Gregory as their captive. He died a few months later (May 1085). His last words were, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die an exile."

The conflict between Henry IV and Gregory VII stimulated a war of propaganda between theorists on both sides. "For the first time in medieval Europe we may speak of such a thing as public opinion."[21] One of Henry's staunchest supporters was a lawyer from Ravenna, Peter Crassus, who defended royal prerogatives in terms of Roman law. Manegold of Lautenbach was a papal theorist who formulated a contract theory of government.

> Since . . . no one can make himself an emperor or king, the people raise some man above themselves for these reasons, to rule and govern them by virtue of his just authority . . . . If, however, he breaks the compact by which he was elected and ruins and confounds what he was established to order correctly, reason justly considers that he has absolved the people from their duty of submission to him since he himself first broke the bond of mutual fidelity by which he was bound to them and they to him.[22]

The introduction of Roman legal precedent into European political thought was perhaps the most far-reaching

result of the controversy over investiture. It generally served the interests of the secular rulers. Up to the 11th century medieval kings had relied heavily on clerical advisors, but after the investiture controversy they tended to look to the newly emerging class of lawyers for counsel. This change helped to secularize the state and to accelerate the growth of nationalism.

Henry V (1106–1125) continued the struggle with the papacy, but by this time the First Crusade had diverted Europe's attention to a new field of endeavor. Indeed, the pope's call for the crusade hinted that it would serve as a "safety-valve": "Let those who have formerly . . . contend[ed] against the faithful fight against the infidel." [23] The Gregorian epoch came to a close with the Concordat of Worms between Calixtus II and Henry V (September 1122), in which the emperor agreed to the canonical election of bishops and to the investiture of spiritual authority (ring and staff) by the archbishop. However the king was permitted to be present at the election and to invest the bishop with the temporalities of his office. In effect the kings still controlled the choice of bishops, for without income from the lands which they held from the king, the bishops were unable to maintain themselves.

ENGLAND

From the days of the evangelization of England by Augustine and his followers there had always been an intimate relationship between the rulers and bishops. In fact Christianity owed its success in large part to the support it received from the newly converted princes. The Anglo-Saxon rulers who reigned from the 6th century to 1066, appointed bishops and abbots as their chief advisors in the witan (king's council), and throughout England the bishops sat as judges in the county courts together with the counts and sheriffs. The rulers, however, were not passive recipients of clerical advice.

England's champion against the Norse invaders of the 9th century, king Alfred of Wessex (871–899), was also famous for his zeal in the reform of the church and monas-

ticism. In 878 he concluded a peace treaty with the leader of the Danes (as the Norse were called) whereby the invader agreed to receive Christian baptism and cease his depredations. Alfred himself translated from the Latin the *Pastoral Care* of Gregory the Great, Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, a *History* by Orosius, and *The Consolation of Philosophy* by Boethius. He also instituted the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, next to Bede the most important source for English history before the 11th century.

In 1066 Duke William of Normandy ("The Conqueror") invaded England and was elected king, thereby ending the Anglo-Saxon dynasty. William separated the civil from the church courts, and he decreed that no pope would be recognized in England without the king's permission and that none of the king's immediate vassals could be excommunicated or conciliar decrees promulgated in the realm without his sanction. It is one of the ironies of history that William (king in England 1066–1087) gained control over the English church during the same time Hildebrand was contesting the German king's claims in this regard, and that William's actions actually received the pope's blessings. One explanation for this apparently inconsistent attitude is that the English king's activities were considered beneficial for the church while Henry's in Germany were not. William, advised by the archbishop of Canterbury, Lanfranc, followed a program of church reform. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* says of the Conqueror:

> He was mild to those good men who loved God, but severe beyond measure toward those who withstood his will. He founded a noble monastery on the spot where God permitted him to conquer England, and he established monks in it, and he made it very rich. In his days the great monastery at Canterbury was built, and many others also throughout England; moreover this land was filled with monks who lived after the rule of St. Benedict; and such was the state of religion in his days that all who would, might observe that which was prescribed by their respective orders.[24]

William's son and successor, William II (Rufus, 1087 to 1100) completely ignored the rights of the church. From

1087 to 1095 he refused to recognize any pope in England, and for 4 years he deliberately kept the see of Canterbury vacant, declaring that he would be his own archbishop. In 1093 he finally appointed Anselm of Bec to Canterbury, but because of his allegiance to the pope and attempts at reform, Anselm was forced to flee England. The next king, Henry I (1100–1135), another son of the Conqueror, invited him back, but in 1103 Anselm again had to leave England because of his refusal to do homage to the king and to consecrate bishops Henry had chosen.

During Anselm's second absence a compromise was negotiated through the efforts of Ivo of Chartres and Hugh of Fleury, who drew a distinction between the spiritual and temporal offices of a bishop. Anselm returned in 1107 and ratified a settlement wherein the king gave up the practice of investing bishops with ring and staff, but he retained the right to receive feudal homage for the lands attached to the bishop's churches. This agreement set the precedent for the German-Roman settlement of the question at Worms, 1122.

From 1135 to 1154 England was torn by a civil war, and during the disorders the church regained a large measure of its independence. The anarchy was ended by Henry Plantagenet (1154–1189), a grandson of Henry I and, one of England's greatest kings; he was the first of the house of Anjou to ascend the throne. Henry at 21 was ruler of a vast continental empire which stretched from Ireland to the Pyrenees. For the next 2 centuries the English kings ruled half the territory of France as well as England.

The issue of church-state relations during the reign of Henry II turned largely on his struggle with the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket. The king attempted to curtail the liberties the church had acquired during the civil war by restating the principles which had been followed by William the Conqueror. To facilitate this he appointed his close friend and chancellor of the realm to the archbishopric of Canterbury, but Thomas à Becket was no sooner installed than he began to champion the cause of the church. In 1164 the king drew up a statement of the customs of the realm, called the Constitutions of Clarendon, which were ratified by the clergy including the archbishop. This document

restored to the crown most of the authority over the church which William the Conqueror had exercised. Soon after its adoption Thomas repudiated it and left England. The pope, however, took a middle position, exhorting the archbishop to "be discreet, and we warn, advise and exhort you to show yourself wary, prudent and circumspect . . . . Do nothing hastily . . . . forbear with the king." [25]

The 6-year controversy which followed culminated in the murder of the archbishop when he returned to Canterbury at Christmas in 1170. According to a contemporary account, Henry in a fit of rage had been heard to ask whether anyone in the realm was able to rid him of this upstart priest, and four knights obliged their lord by committing the crime at the altar of Canterbury cathedral. The king was forced by the public outrage at his alleged complicity in the murder to do penance by establishing monasteries and giving "benefit of clergy," the right of priests to be tried in church courts. He also suspended several clauses of the Constitutions.

One of Henry's sons, King Richard "the lion-hearted" (1189–1199) is best known as the adventurer of the Third Crusade, and another son, John (1199–1216), as the signer of the Magna Charta in 1215 which established the principle that the king is subject to law. King John is especially known for his struggle with Pope Innocent III over the selection of the archbishop of Canterbury. Exercising the long established prerogative of kings, John insisted on his choice, the canons of Canterbury chose a second candidate, but the pope's man, Stephen Langton, finally became archbishop. During this struggle the pope placed England under the interdict (1208) and excommunicated the king (1212). The result of the pope's victory was a temporary curtailment of royal influence in ecclesiastical affairs.

During the 13th century the principle of representative government gained rapidly in England—most conspicuously at the parliaments of 1265 and the "model parliament" of 1295. In the latter assembly the church was represented by 2 archbishops, 18 bishops, and 27 abbots. Clerical influence was exercised in Parliament through the upper chamber, the House of Lords, where the clergy was known collectively as the "Lords Spiritual." In this way the mutual interests of

church and state continued to be served through the one institution of government, and ecclesiastical affairs were regulated by the king through parliament. It is because of this medieval development that the English Reformation of the 16th century became a matter of state in which king and parliament played a large part.

FRANCE

In 987 the last of the Carolingian rulers in France died, and Hugh Capet was elected to the throne, inaugurating a long dynasty of Capetian kings which lasted until 1328. The archbishop of Rheims, Adalberon, was primarily responsible for this change in ruling houses when he declared that "the throne is not by hereditary right."

The relationship between kings and popes in France before 1300 was never as strained as in other areas of Europe. One reason for this was the pitifully weak condition of the monarchy under the early Capetians, who were generally dominated by their more powerful vassals. Another factor was the genuine fidelity of the French rulers to the papacy. On numerous occasions popes found hospitality in France, "the eldest daughter of the church," when residence in Rome became impossible. By 1108 the investiture question had been settled in France under terms similar to those in England. Bishops and abbots were to be elected according to canon law, but the king retained the right of investing them with the temporalities of their office. He could therefore influence clerical elections, and later kings exercised this right to the detriment of the church.

King Louis IX (1226–1270), declared a saint in 1297, is the epitome of a most Christian king. He was austere in his private life and insisted that every man, no matter what his station, have access to the king's justice. His biographer wrote of him:

> The rule of his land was so arranged that every day he heard the hours sung, and a requiem mass without song; and then, if it was convenient, the mass of the day, or of the saint, with song. Every day he rested in his bed after having eaten . . . . At

> night he heard complines. . . . Ofttimes . . . he would go after his mass, and seat himself in the woods of Vincennes, and lean against an oak, and make us sit around him. And all those who had any cause in hand came and spoke to him without hindrance.[26]

The king's piety did not prevent him from being one of France's strongest monarchs, and although he was a loyal supporter of the church, he wrote to the pope in 1247 that in cases of national emergency it was the king's right to confiscate the treasure of the churches and all their temporal possessions.

HOHENSTAUFEN RULERS OF GERMANY

The Concordat of 1122 did not end the controversy between papacy and empire. From 1138 to 1268 a strong family of kings from Swabia known as the Hohenstaufen (from the name of their home castle) ruled the empire. The two strongest representatives were Frederick I and Frederick II. They championed a centralized monarchy and a powerful state, and those who supported their cause became known as the Ghibellines. They were opposed by the particularistic ambitions of the feudal nobility who allied themselves with the papacy to thwart the ambitions of the emperors. This party became known as the Guelphs. Ghibelline-Guelph rivalries dominated German-Italian-papal politics for several centuries.

Frederick I (1152–1190), also known as "Barbarossa" because of his red beard, claimed for the empire the same sacred origin and dignity as that of the church, and to underscore his claims he coined the designation Holy Roman Empire. The revival of Roman law by Irnerius at Bologna around 1100 provided a theory of temporal sovereignty which elaborated on Justinian's Code, which had said, "God set the Imperial dispensation at the head of human affairs . . ." and, "The Emperor is not bound by statutes."[27] The popes of the 12th century also used Roman law, but in their case it was used to develop ecclesiastical law into a system which made possible the unprecedented growth of administrative

unity in the church. Gratian, a monk of Bologna, pioneered in collecting ecclesiastical laws in his *Decretum* of 1140. Thus both papal and imperial parties were far more formidable antagonists than during the days of Hildebrand a century earlier.

In 1155 Frederick I arrived in Rome on the first of six Italian campaigns, and in return for rescuing the pope from the control of Roman factions he was crowned emperor. The pope, irritated by Frederick's imperious attitude, followed the example of his predecessors and contracted a military alliance with the Normans of southern Italy. Two years later an incident occurred at Besancon which fanned papal-imperial animosities to fever pitch. The papal emissary, Roland, the future Pope Alexander III, read a letter of Pope Hadrian IV to the emperor:

> Thou shouldst not forget, my most glorious son, how graciously the Holy Roman Church lately conferred upon thee the imperial crown. . . . Nay, we should rejoice to confer even greater *beneficia* upon thee, if that were possible.[28]

When the assembly heard the word *beneficia* a tumult ensued, for the imperial supporters interpreted this to mean "fief" and that the emperor was thereby a vassal of the pope. Frederick called it "a false and lying statement. We hold this kingdom and empire through the election of the princes from God alone. . . . Therefore whoever says that we hold the imperial crown as a benefice from the pope resists the divine institution and is a liar."[29] The pope explained that he had intended the term simply in its literal sense, meaning good deeds.

When Hadrian IV died in 1159, the College of Cardinals elected Alexander III, but a small faction supported Victor IV. The papal election decree of 1059 did not specify whether unanimity was required for a valid election, and Frederick decided to support the minority faction. The schism which ensued lasted almost 20 years.

The emperor summoned a council to meet in Pavia, since "in my office and dignity as emperor I can convoke councils, as did Constantine, etc." Only imperial representatives attended, and Victor IV was declared the true pope,

though Sicily, Spain, France, and England recognized Alexander III. It was probably due to Alexander's need for English support that he tended to side with the king against Thomas à Becket. In order to prevent a recurrence of such confusion, a papal election decree of the Third Lateran Council in 1179 stated that a valid election required a two-thirds majority of the cardinals.

In 1166 Frederick and his army marched on Rome to install their antipope. Alexander III fled to France.

Much of Frederick's reign was taken up with a struggle for control of the north Italian towns. In 1158 the imperial armies crushed all opposition, and at the Diet of Roncaglia the towns were denied all right of self-rule. The city of Milan refused to acquiesce in this decision and was reduced to ashes. By 1166 the towns had organized the Lombard League which allied itself with the papacy against the emperor. When Frederick returned to Germany from installing his own pope in Rome, he found it necessary to make his way through Lombardy disguised as a peasant. The emperor now laid plans to reconquer the towns, but the decisive battle of Legnano in 1176 was a complete victory for the Lombard League. This was the first major defeat in medieval history of feudal cavalry by infantry.

As a result of Frederick's loss he found it necessary to recognize Alexander III as pope, and in the Peace of Constance in 1183 he fully recognized the autonomy of the Italian towns. However, he retained control over a large extent of Italy, since the towns' rights were limited to the area within their walls, and even here the emperor gained jurisdiction in the courts.

In 1184, Frederick's son, Henry VI, was engaged to Constance, heiress to the kingdom of southern Italy and Sicily. This posed a serious threat to the papacy, since through this marriage the kings of Germany would also rule southern Italy, thus effectively surrounding the papal states with Hohenstaufen influence.

In 1188 the old emperor took over the leadership of the Third Crusade, but 2 years later he drowned while bathing in a river in Cilicia. In subsequent years he became a legen-

dary figure, and during 19th-century German nationalism *der alte Kaiser*, the great Barbarossa, became a romantic symbol for the medieval glory of the Germanies.

Frederick Barbarossa was succeeded by his son, Henry VI, and when he was also crowned king of Sicily in 1194, the worst fears of the papacy were realized. Not only did Henry enjoy a commanding position in Italy, but he also received tribute from Constantinople and the Mohammedan princes of North Africa, had claims to Aragon in Spain, and was overlord of Bohemia and Hungary. The Holy Roman empire appeared well on its way toward domination of the West when Henry VI died suddenly at Palermo in 1197 at the age of 32 years.

Henry's death revived the old Guelph-Ghibelline rivalries, and for 15 years Germany was torn by civil war. Frederick II, infant son of Henry and Constance and heir to the German throne, grew up in Sicily as a ward of the pope.

INNOCENT III

In 1198 the greatest of all medieval popes ascended Peter's throne as Innocent III. The young 37-year-old pontiff sought to free the papal states from all outside interference, to combat heresy, and to extend Christianity by fighting the Moslems. His most dramatic activity, however, lay in his attempts to bring secular governments under the guidance of his office. By his decretal *Venerabilem* he claimed the right to decide between the pretenders to the German throne. "If the votes of the princes are divided in an election, we can favor one of the parties . . . [since] consecration and coronation are demanded of us."[30] In a dispute between King Philip of France and King John of England, the pope intervened on behalf of John. When the French king protested unwarranted interference by the pope, Innocent replied that a sin had been committed, and "it pertains to our office to rebuke any Christian for any mortal sin and to coerce him with ecclesiastical penalties if he spurns our correction."[31] In a private letter issued shortly after his consecration the pope declared, "Just as the moon derives its light from the sun, and is indeed lower than it in quantity and quality, in

position and in power, so too the royal power derives the splendor of its dignity from the pontifical authority." [32] The papal interdict of England in 1208 was based on Innocent's theocratic world view. In reality he was declaring no new papal theories, but he was in a better position in history to bring practice into line with theory than were his predecessors. His policies have called forth more debates among historians than those of most other medieval popes.

FREDERICK II

The German civil war came to an end when the 16-year old Frederick II, son of Henry VI and grandson of Barbarossa, came to the German throne. By character and upbringing he was a Sicilian. Though he was king both in Sicily and Germany, he left the princes north of the Alps to themselves while he concentrated his attention in the south. In fact he visited Germany only once during the last 30 years of his life.

Without question Frederick was one of the most gifted monarchs in European history. He was accomplished in statecraft, architecture, mathematics, philosophy, art, sculpture, natural science; and he spoke nine languages. It is no wonder that his contemporaries called him the *stupor mundi*, wonder of the world. In matters of religion he was a skeptic. He maintained a harem of Saracen women, and he employed Moslem mercenaries in his wars against the Christian cities of Italy. It is not surprising that he was unimpressed by papal claims to be vicars of Christ.

Frederick was crowned emperor by the pope in 1220, and in return for this favor he promised to lead a crusade to the Holy Land. For the next 6 years, however, he concerned himself primarily with organizing his Sicilian estates and with attempting to unite all of Italy by placing it under his control. Naturally the popes viewed this plan with alarm, and in 1227 the emperor was excommunicated for failure to keep his crusader's vow. Two years later he finally led the crusade, but since the excommunication was still in force the pope found it necessary to oppose the crusade. When he reached Palestine, Frederick negotiated a settlement with

the Moslems instead of making war. Many Western Christians looked upon such diplomacy as treachery, and they approved when the pope promptly placed Jerusalem under the interdict as soon as Frederick crowned himself king of the holy city. In 1230 a truce was finally arranged between the antagonists, and the excommunication was lifted.

Upon his return from the crusade Frederick energetically sought to unite the Lombard towns of north Italy to his own holdings in the south. His vision was one of reviving Rome's ancient glories:

> Our heart has ever burned with the desire to reinstate in the position of their ancient dignity the Founder of the Roman empire and the Foundress, Rome herself, that in our auspicious days . . . the blood of Romulus may revive, the imperial Roman speech be heard again in its glory, the ancient Roman dignity renewed and an inseparable bond by our grace be tied between the Roman empire and the Roman people themselves.[33]

The pope who vigorously opposed these designs was Gregory IX (1227–1241), who was also the best canon lawyer of his day. He kept up a constant struggle with the emperor and in 1239 excommunicated him a second time because of his Lombard policy. The propaganda on both sides became lively and heated. The pope declared:

> This King of the Pestilence has proclaimed that, to use his own words, all the world has been deceived by three deceivers, Jesus Christ, Moses, and Mohammed, of whom two died in honor but Christ upon the Cross. . . . and Frederick maintains that no man should believe aught but what may be proved by the power and reason of nature.[34]

Frederick in turn compared himself to Elijah rooting out the prophet of Baal, claiming that the emperor was God's representative on earth and any who opposed him were antichrists. In 1241 the pope called a council to depose the emperor, but Frederick managed to capture the ships which were carrying the prelates to the meeting. The capture of an entire ecumenical council scandalized even the most ardent imperialists.

Finally in 1245 the pope managed to slip away from Rome and convene a council at Lyons in France. There Frederick was deposed from office for perjury, sacrilege, and heresy—charges which were no doubt well founded. His response to the news of his deposition was said to be, "I have been the anvil long enough. Now I shall be the hammer," and he proceeded to launch an attack against the wealthy clergy, maintaining that "all true religion is choked by their surfeit of riches and power. Hence to deprive such men of the baneful wealth that burdens them to their own damnation is a work of charity." [35]

Frederick died in 1250, leaving two young sons who carried on his struggles but died in the attempt. In 1268 the 15-year-old grandson of Frederick was beheaded, and the Hohenstaufen dynasty came to an end. Although Germany was fragmented into hundreds of small autonomous states, the Germans continued their opposition to the papacy. Many scholars view the Lutheran Reformation in part as an extension of the medieval controversy between popes and German rulers.

The revival of Aristotelian studies, especially his *Politics*, served the interests of the state in its struggle with the church. So long as men were generally agreed that the state was established by God to curb sin, that is, as a negative institution for the sake of law and order, statesmen were at a disadvantage in dealing with popes. Aristotle, however, had said that the state originated in human nature, from below. It was an end in itself to serve the needs of society. The "Aristotelian conception of the *societas humana* provided the early fourteenth-century challenge to hierocratic thought, [and] provided the framework out of which the modern nation-state could arise." [36] The church itself offered a more positive basis for the existence of the state through the writings of Thomas Aquinas, who found the origins of government not in divine law but in natural law. "It is natural for man, more than any other animal, to be a social and political animal, to live in a group." [37]

The emerging national states had further reason to be critical of traditional loyalties to the papacy. The clergy theoretically held primary allegiance to a foreign power, the

pope, instead of to the king. This was especially true of religious orders whose monasteries were often controlled by a motherhouse in a foreign land. Even more serious was the drainage of money which regularly flowed to Rome at the very time kings required more revenues to build their states. Thus nationalism helped the growth of the anti-clericalism which was already in the air.

PHILIP IV

The final drama in medieval church-state relations arose over the right of kings to tax clergy in their realm. Philip IV of France (1285–1314) was an ambitious ruler who sought to put the theory of national sovereignty into practice. In 1296 he was at war with England, a prelude to that series of intermittent battles known as the Hundred Years War. In both countries the churches were being taxed to finance the conflict, since both kings declared it a "just war." The pope, Boniface VIII (1294–1303), determined to end the war by denying both monarchs the right to tax the clergy. He declared that "any prelates and ecclesiastical persons . . . who shall promise or agree to pay to lay persons collections or taxes . . . by any other title or manner of pretext . . . and whatsoever emperors, kings, or princes . . . who shall impose, exact, or receive [them] . . . should incur sentence of excommunication." [38] With this pronouncement the pope explicitly counseled all clergy to disobey their king. Philip responded by forbidding the export of all currency and precious gems from France to Rome. Within a year the pope compromised by agreeing that in an emergency the king might tax the clergy. Meanwhile Philip had been negotiating with the Colonna family of Rome which was opposed to the pope, and confronted with this formidable coalition Boniface conceded that kings could tax clergy.

In 1301 a second dispute arose. Philip arrested a French bishop on charges of treason and heresy, tried him in the king's court, and threw him into prison. This time the issue was that of papal jurisdiction over the clergy in matters of dogma, and the pope could ill afford to permit this challenge to go unanswered. He commanded all French bishops to

appear in Rome to discuss the ecclesiastical situation in France. With this summons Boniface sent Philip a letter which began, "Listen . . . son . . . . God has set us over kings and kingdoms . . . let no one persuade you that you have no superior or that you are not subject to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, for he is a fool who so thinks." [39] The king burned the letter, forbade French bishops to leave the country, and in April 1302 convened his own assembly of clergy, nobles, and townsmen which met at Paris in Notre Dame cathedral. This was the first meeting in French history of a representative Estates-General (parliament). The assembly, completely dominated by the king's men, refused to acknowledge Boniface as the legitimate pope.

The pope's response was the bull *Unam Sanctam,* one of the most famous of all medieval papal pronouncements, in which he flatly stated, "we declare, state, define and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." [40] The king responded by sending his minister, William of Nogaret, to Anagni where Boniface was staying. The aged pope was brutally handled, and he died a few weeks later.

After this debacle the French king gained control over papal elections, and from 1309 to 1377 the papal residence was at Avignon in southern France. This period became known as the Babylonian Captivity of the papacy.

The meaning of this 1,000-year struggle between papacy and empire remains a matter of controversy. At its heart lay the problem of defining the right relationship between spiritual power and temporal order. Then as now, a strong religious leader was in a position to influence temporal affairs. The ideologies which lay behind the individual actions and words of kings and popes remain in tension today.

NOTES—CHAPTER 4

1. From *Readings in Church History*, ed. Colman J. Barry, I (Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1960), p. 147.
2. Gelasius, "Letter to Anastasius," in Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050—1300* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964), p. 15.
3. The Donation of Constantine, trans. based on Laffan, *Select Documents*,

I, in *Documents of the Christian Church*, ed. H. Bettenson, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford University Press), 1963, pp. 139–140.

4. Thietmar of Merseburg, in G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966), p. 59.
5. Hugh of Fleury, in Tellenbach, p. 149.
6. Ibid.
7. "The 'Anonymous of York,'" in Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050–1300* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964), p. 78.
8. Alanus, ibid., p. 123.
9. "The deposition of Childeric," ibid., p. 20.
10. *Admonitio generalis*, 789, University of Pennyslvania Translations and Reprints Series, VI, No. 5 (Philadelphia, 1900), p. 15.
11. *De litteris colendis*, ibid., p. 12.
12. Agobard of Lyons, *Liber adversus legem Gundobadi* in Jeremiah O'Sullivan and John Burns, *Medieval Europe* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1943), p. 482. Migne, *PL* 104:126.
13. *The Era of Charlemagne*, Stewart C. Easton and Helene Wieruszowski (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Anvil, 1961), p. 168.
14. Ibid., p. 127.
15. Tierney, p. 23.
16. T. M. Parker, *Christianity and the State in the Light of History* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955) as cited by Schafer Williams, *The Gregorian Epoch* (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1964), p. 89.
17. Tierney, pp. 40–42.
18. Ibid., pp. 38, 39.
19. Tierney, p. 51.
20. Tierney, p. 59, 60.
21. J. W. Thompson and E. N. Johnson, *An Introduction to Medieval Europe* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1937), p. 386.
22. Tierney, p. 80.
23. Barry, p. 328.
24. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* trans. by W. O. Hassall, *Medieval England as Viewed by Contemporaries* (New York: Harper & Row, Torchbook Series, 1965), p. 49.
25. Tierney, p. 114.
26. From Joinville, *Chronicle*, trans. in James Bruce Ross and Mary Martin McLaughlin, *The Portable Medieval Reader* (New York: The Viking Press, c. 1949, 11th printing 1960), pp. 372–373.
27. *The Digest of Justinian* (533) trans. C. H. Monro (Cambridge, 1904), pp. xxv–xxvi, xxxiii, 22; in Tierney, p. 102.
28. Thompson and Johnson, p. 400.
29. Ibid., pp. 400–401.
30. Tierney, p. 134.
31. Tierney, p. 135.
32. Tierney, p. 132.
33. Thompson and Johnson, pp. 423–424.

34. Ibid., p. 424.
35. Tierney, p. 146.
36. Walter Ullmann, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages*, 2d ed. (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1962), p. 455.
37. Tierney, p. 168.
38. Tierney, pp. 175–176.
39. Tierney, pp. 185–186.
40. Tierney, p. 189.

CHAPTER 5 •

EAST AND WEST

BYZANTIUM

While Europe was under siege by barbarian invaders during much of the early medieval period, causing the political transformation referred to commonly as the "fall" of Rome, the empire continued in the East as a stable institution for more than a thousand years. The Eastern empire at one time or another comprised Asia Minor (its heartland), the Balkan peninsula, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and parts of North Africa. Modern scholars have labeled this civilization by using the name of the old Greek town Byzantium, on the site of which Constantine built Constantinople, but the "Byzantines" always referred to themselves as Romans. Latin continued to be the official language until the 6th century, when it was replaced by Greek. The Roman Empire was never officially divided between East and West, but Diocletian's and Constantine's creation of a second capital at Constantinople in A. D. 330 tended to polarize loyalties around two administrative centers. From the death of Theodosius in 395 until 476 there were always two emperors, one at Milan (later at Ravenna) and the other at Constantinople. When the imperial insignia were transferred from Rome to the East in 476 (the event often associated with Rome's fall), the empire was still considered to be united under the Eastern ruler.

The last great effort to realize this unity in actual fact was made by Justinian (527–565), who sought to reconquer North Africa, Silicy, and Italy from the Vandals and the Goths who had taken control of these territories. Although Justinian's generals, Belisarius and Narses, were initially

successful, after the emperor's death Italy fell prey to the Lombards, and within a few years all of North Africa was lost to the Arabian Moslems. From the 6th century on, therefore, the West tended to pursue its own course, although lip service continued to be given to the ideal of empire with the Eastern monarch acknowledged as the supreme ruler in Christendom. Until the coming of Charlemagne, popes sought the confirmation of their election from the ruler in Constantinople, and Western kings (e. g., Clovis, Alaric, Pepin) took pride in their status as consuls, thus deriving their legitimacy from the Eastern emperor.

Justinian was also active in promoting Christianity, in making Constantinople a capital worthy of the empire, and in codifying Roman law. His biographer, Procopius, informs us:

> In our own age there has been born the Emperor Justinian, who, taking over the State when it was harassed by disorder, has not only made it greater in extent, but also much more illustrious, by expelling from it those barbarians who had from of old pressed hard upon it . . . . and finding that the belief in God was, before his time, straying into errors and being forced to go into many directions, he completely destroyed all the paths leading to such errors, and brought it about that it stood on the firm foundation of a single faith.[1]

Justinian's building program was crowned by the erection of Santa [or Hagia] Sophia, the Church of Holy Wisdom (i. e., Christ), one of the most perfect examples of Byzantine architecture. Its chief feature is its enormous dome, over 120 feet across and 180 feet high. For centuries this was the largest church in Christendom, surpassing in size all the churches of Europe and providing the nerve center for Orthodox (Byzantine) Christianity. In 1453 it was converted by the Turks into a mosque, and in modern times it serves as a museum. Procopius, like his contemporaries, marvelled at the achievement:

> So the church has become a spectacle of marvellous beauty, overwhelming to those who see it, but to those who know it by hearsay altogether incredible. For it soars to a height to match the sky, and as if surging up from among the other

> buildings it stands on high and looks down upon the remainder of the city, adoring it, because it is a part of it, but glorying in its own beauty, because, though a part of the city and dominating it, it at the same time towers above it to such a height that the whole city is viewed from there as from a watch-tower. Both its breadth and its length have been so carefully proportioned that it may not improperly be said to be exceedingly long and at the same time unusually broad. And it exults in an indescribable beauty.[2]

Justinian commissioned a group of lawyers to systematize all existing Roman law: precedents, significant cases, and commentaries. The completed work was the *Corpus Juris Civilis* (or "Justinian Code") which from the 12th century provided the basis for all Western European legal systems, canon as well as civil. The code was especially influential in establishing a legal precedent for the divine rights of monarchy, a concept which materially assisted the centralization of the Western states in the late Middle Ages.

During the 6th and 7th centuries the Eastern Church was torn by controversies over the person of Christ. When the Council of Chalcedon (451) determined that Christ was one person in two natures, it condemned those who insisted on overemphasizing His divine nature (Monophysites—literally, one nature) and those who went to the opposite extreme, stressing His duality (Nestorians). In 551 Justinian condemned three alleged Nestorian writers (an issue therefore named the "three chapters" controversy) in the hope of conciliating the Monophysites. In 553 the Fifth Ecumenical Council, convened by Justinian, ratified his earlier condemnation of the Nestorians. When the pope in Rome condemned this council, the Eastern Church removed his name from the diptychs (lists of people for whom the churches prayed), and the pope eventually acquiesced in the conciliar decisions.

The Monophysite controversy was not settled, however, and in 638 Emperor Heraclius issued a compromise statement ("Ekthesis") in which he declared that the two natures of Christ were united in one will (monothelitism). The pope refused to agree to this statement; he excommunicated the

Eastern patriarch. But in 653 the emperor had another pope, Martin I, arrested and brought to Constantinople as a prisoner, where he died after suffering many indignities. He is the last pope who is revered as a martyr. The Sixth Ecumenical Council, held at Constantinople in 681 but presided over by papal envoys, condemned monothelitism and reaffirmed the Chalcedonian formulation. Ten years later another council was held in the East in order to complete the Fifth and Sixth Ecumenical Councils by adding disciplinary canons. This council (called the Trullan Synod or Quinisext) was rejected by the pope because it made claims of authority for the patriarch of Constantinople equal to those of the bishop of Rome.

By the end of the 7th century these theological controversies had resulted in the formation of several Eastern churches which opposed the theology of Constantinople. There was the Church of Armenia which had never accepted the decisions of Chalcedon. The Armenians, furthermore, were politically the subjects of Persia, and to emphasize their patriotism they repudiated the Eastern empire by embracing the Monophysite position. The Syrian Monophysites also became a separate body under the leadership of Jacob Baradaeus, from whom they are known as Jacobites. The Egyptians were also inclined toward Monophysitism, and the Coptic Church there was organized in opposition to the Byzantine Church. A political factor also entered into this situation, because the Egyptians resented Byzantine political controls, and the theological argument over the nature of Christ served to lay bare submerged feelings of exasperated nationalism. They referred derisively to the Greeks who lived among them as "Melkites" (followers of the emperor).

On the opposite side of the Christological question stood the Nestorians, who had also been condemned by Chalcedon. The Christians living in Persia generally espoused Nestorianism, which, because it was condemned as heretical by Byzantium, had the added advantage of reassuring the Persian government of the Christians' loyalty. The church in Persia was highly organized, having its own patriarch, metropolitans, and bishops. Its intellectual center was the monas-

tery at Nisibis. The Nestorians of Persia established the Church of Malabar in India, and by the 14th century they had carried Christianity across Asia as far as Peking.

Scattered among these Eastern independent churches were small groups of Christians who rejected both the authority of Byzantium and that of their national church, choosing instead to follow Rome. These are known as Uniat churches. In 1950 the total number of Uniats was estimated at over 8 million members. Thus throughout her history the Byzantine Church lived in tension between the Latins of the West and the nationalist dissenting churches to the East. The endemic theological warfare among the Christians in the East helps to explain the astonishing speed with which the armies of Islam were able to subdue them shortly after the death of Mohammed.

After Justinian, "the last of the Roman emperors," Byzantium was threatened by invasion from two sides; to the south and east were the Arabs and Persians, to the north lay the Slavs and Bulgars. The task of defending the empire for the next 500 years fell primarily to four dynasties: the Heraclids, the Isaurians, the Amorians, and the Macedonians.

Heraclius (610–641) succeeded in recapturing Jerusalem from the Persians in 630, though the armies of Allah recaptured it 8 years later. Heraclius also reorganized the empire into a series of military provinces called "themes" whereby a general and a civilian were placed in charge of each province, subject only to the emperor. By the end of the Heraclean dynasty, however, Byzantium had been reduced by the onslaughts of Islam to Asia Minor, the Balkans, and southern Italy. Between 673 and 677 Constantinople itself lay under attack. The first of the Isaurian rulers, Leo III (717–741) also found it necessary to defend the capital, but by the end of his reign the Moslems had been expelled from Asia Minor. The pinnacle of the Byzantine Empire came under the Macedonian rulers (867–1056), a period of external expansion and internal prosperity. Basil I (867 to 886) initiated the dynasty; his son, Leo VI (886–912), revised the Justinian Code; and his son, Constantine VII (913–959), produced some of our most valuable sources dealing with the affairs of the Byzantine court and state.

He wrote a biography of his grandfather, Basil I, a *Book of Ceremonies* containing information about court protocol, and a treatise for his son *On Administering the Empire.* He offers this advice on marriage:

> Concerning this matter also a dread and authentic charge and ordinance of the great and holy Constantine is engraved upon the sacred table of the catholic church of the Christians, St. Sophia, that never shall an emperor of the Romans ally himself in marriage with a nation of customs differing from and alien to those of the Roman order, especially with one that is infidel and unbaptized, unless it be with the Franks alone; for they alone were excepted by that great man, the holy Constantine, because he himself drew his origin from those parts; for there is much relationship and converse between Franks and Romans.[3]

Under Basil II (976–1025) Byzantium reached the height of its influence and extent. An 11th-century chronicler records the almost ascetical regimen he observed to accomplish his aims.

> He even went so far as to scorn bodily adornments. His neck was unadorned by collars, his head by diadems. He refused to make himself conspicuous in purple-colored cloaks and he put away superfluous rings, even clothes of different colors. On the other hand, he took great pains to ensure that the various departments of the government should be centered on himself, and that they should work, without friction.[4]

Basil defeated the Egyptians, pushed the Arabs back into Arabia, and recovered practically the entire Balkan peninsula, for which feat he was styled *Bulgaroctonos,* the Bulgar-slayer. At his death the empire extended from the Danube to the Upper Tigris and west to Sicily. Perhaps the most far-reaching event during his reign was the conversion of Russia to Christianity, a circumstance brought about by the fortuitous marriage of his sister, Anna, to Vladimir, prince of Kiev.[5]

But the empire soon fell on evil days. The Arabian caliphate was itself taken captive by migrants from central Asia, the fierce Seljuk Turks. In 1071 they defeated a By-

zantine army at Manzikert, capturing the emperor himself. Shortly thereafter they established their capital at Iconium in the heart of Asia Minor. It was this threat that led to Byzantium's appeal for help from the Franks and resulted in the First Crusade.

Part of the legacy of old Rome to Byzantium was the supremacy of the emperor in matters of religion as well as state. Constantine himself had called the first ecumenical council, and each of the six subsequent ecumenical councils was convened by emperors who often injected their own ideas into the proceedings and promulgated the ecclesiastical canons as imperial law. This typically Byzantine concentration of complete civil as well as religious power in the hands of the emperor has been labelled caesaropapism by modern Western historians, although the term itself was unknown to the Byzantines. The difference in point of view between the East and the West on the issue of church-state relations can be traced back at least as far as Augustine and Eusebius. Where Augustine saw their relationship as one of tension between the "city of God" and the "city of man," with the former possessing a moral superiority, Eusebius tended to see the state as the protector of the church and the emperor as God's vicar on earth, His "image," to whom the church owed support and gratitude. However, emperor and patriarch were to work in harmony for the welfare of the whole, as expressed by the 9th-century emperor Leo VI:

> As the polity . . . consists, like man, of parts and members, the greatest and most necessary parts are the emperor and the patriarch. Wherefore the peace and felicity of subjects in body and soul is [depends on] the agreement and concord of the kingship and priesthood in all things.[6]

This was the ideal. In actual practice the emperors believed that they were also personally responsible for the supervision of the church. Leo III identified himself with the role of St. Peter: "Since God handed over to us the sovereignty of the Empire, as was His good pleasure, He also . . . commanded us, as He commanded Peter the supreme head of the apostles, to feed His most faithful flock."[7] Throughout their history the Byzantines believed that the emperor de-

rived his authority directly from God, hence his titles, "Christos Kyriou" ("anointed by the Lord") and "living icon of Christ." They alone of the laity were privileged to enter the sanctuary of the church, to preach, to commune themselves in the same manner as priests, and to convene church councils. Emperors believed that they were bound to rule on earth according to the divine model in heaven, with themselves assuming the role of God. They defended the faith, converted the pagans, and punished heretics. But imperial control of the church was not absolute, for in the last analysis it was still the ecumenical council which defined dogma and exercised church discipline. Emperors maintained almost unlimited administrative control over the church and enjoyed liturgical privileges, but in matters of teaching every imperial attempt to revise traditional dogma failed.[8] On the whole, imperial control worked smoothly, and only a few energetic patriarchs chafed under the system.

The patriarch, standing at the apex of the Byzantine hierarchy, was assisted by metropolitans who were set over ecclesiastical provinces, each of which was subdivided into bishoprics. Although most parish priests were married, bishops were required to be celibate, and most of them were chosen from the monasteries. During the 4th century the patriarch of Constantinople claimed precedence over all other Eastern churches because he resided in the capital. The three ancient patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria resisted his pretensions, as did the pope in Rome, but the Moslem conquests of the older churches during the 7th century left the patriarch of Constantinople as the sole leader of the Eastern churches. His authority never became as centralized as that of the papacy in the West, but he governed the churches as "first among equals," leaving each of the metropolitans and bishops largely in control of their own jurisdictions.

Monasticism attracted many to its ranks. The ascetic life in a religious community was considered to be a superior style of Christianity, and by the 8th century tens of thousands of men and women lived as monastics. Eastern monasticism tended to follow the eremitical and isolationist examples of early Egyptian fathers, and unlike those in the West, the

monks usually did not become involved in the life of the institutional church (with the exception of those who became bishops). Mount Athos in Greece, isolated on a narrow peninsula in the Aegean, was well populated with hermits dwelling in caves and other ascetics living in inaccessible spots. To this day 20 monasteries and 200 hermitages of Mount Athos continue to function under the jurisdiction of the patriarch exactly as they did 10 centuries ago. Byzantine monks never separated into orders but remained under the single rule of St. Basil of Caesarea (d. 379).

Byzantine worship was surrounded with rich ceremonial and conducted in churches decorated with mosaics and frescoes representing Christ and the saints. The liturgy of the Eucharist, usually that of St. John Chrysostom or Saint Basil, was celebrated as a timeless event, an Appearance (epiphany) of Christ in which the congregation experienced the actual event of the Supper, not as it was or will be but as it is forever. The services began with the "Little Entrance" and the singing of the Trisagion followed by the lessons and sermon. Then came the "Great Entrance" in which the celebrants carried around the church the bread and wine which were to be consecrated while the choirs sang and the people responded to the exalted entry of Christ Himself. The Nicene Creed and the commemoration of the living and dead followed, and then came the consecration of the elements themselves, in which the *epiklesis* or prayer for the Holy Spirit was central. (In the West the words of Christ, "Take eat, etc.," came to be considered the heart of the liturgy.) Most of the liturgical action took place at the altar, which was closed off from the worshipers by the *iconostasis,* the icon screen. All communicants received both wine and leavened bread. Although the Eastern Church was never much concerned with fixing a definite number of sacraments, it observed the same rites as had become familiar in the West. Children were baptized as infants, usually by immersion, and chrismation (anointing) was administered immediately after baptism. The Eucharist was given to all who had received chrismation, including the children, and penance was available for those who were troubled by their sins.

Throughout Byzantine Christianity there was an empha-

sis on the incarnation of Christ and the mysteries attending the relationship between Christ's human and divine natures. (In the West the tendency was to emphasize His crucifixion as being of central significance.) Although the Council of Chalcedon had settled the Christological controversy, Eastern Christians still tended to stress the divine nature of Christ over the human. This "divinizing" of Christ can be seen most clearly in the iconographic figure of the *Christ Pantokrator*, the All-Ruler, whose portrait was placed in the highest part of the church. Such was the emphasis on Christ's deity that historians have sometimes claimed the *Pantokrator* was the First Person of the Trinity in the guise of the Second Person. Because Christ was viewed more as God than as man, the Byzantines required intermediaries to bridge the chasm between sinners and God. The Virgin Mary served to function in this role together with the saints. The Eastern Church tended to distrust the physical, and its rites, sacraments, liturgy, and art all assisted to transport the believer out of the material world into the presence of the divine. Easter was celebrated with greater solemnity than it was in the West as the event which liberated Christ from His human form. This particular emphasis has prompted some critics to disparage the Byzantine ethos as mystical, but at the same time it has inspired some of the world's most uplifting art, architecture, and liturgical forms.

The decisions of the first seven ecumenical councils, along with the Scriptures, were considered the basis of the Orthodox faith. (Note: "Orthodox" in its restricted sense has from earliest times applied to those churches in communion with that of Constantinople.) In addition the Nicene Creed as revised at Constantinople (381) was accepted as the only authoritative creedal statement, and as such enjoyed wider acceptance than any other creed. The Apostles' Creed, though its roots were buried deep in antiquity, did not achieve a fixed form until the 8th century, and the Easterners rejected it as a novelty. After the 8th century, Eastern theologians tended to look upon dogma as a fixed body of teaching which was to be safeguarded and handed on, but which was incapable of change or progress.

The greatest Orthodox theologian, whose authority re-

mains decisive in Eastern churches to this day, was St. John of Damascus (d. 749). His contributions were more in the nature of method than in originality of thought. His major work, *The Fount of Knowledge,* was in three parts: an appreciation of the philosophy of Aristotle to elucidate Christian dogma, a description of 100 heresies, and an exposition of the Orthodox faith *(De Orthodoxa Fide)* with special reference to the two natures of Christ.

> Since, then, in our Lord Jesus Christ we recognize two natures in one composite Person for both, when we are considering the natures, we call them divinity and humanity. But, when we consider the composite Person of the two natures, we sometimes call Christ both God and Man and God incarnate, naming Him from both; and sometimes we name Him from one of the two and call Him just God and Son of God, or just Man and Son of Man. And also, we sometimes name Him from just the sublime attributes and sometimes from just the more humble ones. For He is one who is alike both the one and the other—the one existing uncaused and eternally from the Father; the other come into being at a later time because of love for men.
>
> Therefore when we speak of the divinity we do not attribute the properties of the humanity to it. Thus we never speak of a passible or created divinity. Neither do we predicate the divine properties of the flesh, for we never speak of uncreated flesh or humanity. In the case of the person, however, whether we name it from both of the parts or from one of them, we attribute the properties of both natures to it.[9]

John taught the divine maternity of Mary, her exemption from original sin, and her bodily assumption into heaven. He also emphasized the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist almost to the exclusion of the earthly elements. His Easter hymns include the widely known "Come, Ye Faithful, Raise the Strain" and "The Day of Resurrection." Thomas Aquinas relied on the Damascene for his methodology.

While Western Christianity was in its deepest humiliation, the Eastern Church was enjoying its greatest strength. Byzantine culture, the creation of the church, was in full

flower, and Constantinople combined the intellectual glory of ancient Athens with the military might of old Rome. The Western crusaders, coming from their feudal, rustic, provincial enclaves, stood in amazement at the glory of the East. Of all the cities of the medieval world, modern man would have felt more congenial in the urbane and sophisticated society of Constantinople than in the struggling prairie towns of the West. Permeating all the institutions of society was the influence of the church. A modern historian comments:

> The Byzantine Church was indeed an admirable State Church. Its rich ritual enhanced the majesty of the Empire, its saints and its icons brought it down to the level of the people, its obstinate refusal to submit to foreign dictation built up the sentiment of nationality, and there was enough freedom in its theology not to stifle the intellectual activity on which the Empire prided itself. Centuries of Turkish oppression were to force the Orthodox to learn the lowering art of living in the dark; but so long as Constantinople endured as a free Christian city, its Church remained the most civilized religious organization that the world had so far known.[10]

CONTROVERSIES WITH THE WEST

Tensions between the Eastern and Western churches are traceable at least as far back as the Second Ecumenical Council (381) where Constantinople claimed the primacy of honor after Rome, "because Constantinople is the New Rome (Canon 3)." This assertion was repeated at Chalcedon in 451 (Canon 28), but both times Rome rejected the implication that she owed her primacy in the West to mere association with the old capital and not on the theological basis of apostolic foundation by St. Peter. During the Christological controversies of the East in the 6th and 7th centuries the relationship between the churches was often aggravated, and as we have seen, at least one pope was taken prisoner by the Eastern emperor for his refusal to acquiesce in the monothelite ekthesis of Heraclius. In fact, up to 867 the sees of Rome and Constantinople were in a state of schism for a total of 203 years.

The most famous Eastern controversy was basically an internal one for the Byzantine church, but it affected her relations with the West. This was the iconoclastic controversy which lasted from 726 to 843. The icon (image) was to the Byzantines more than a mere picture or mosaic. It was the "window" through which men apprehended the divine, and as such an icon was often believed to possess a divine presence itself. A worshiper's attitude toward the icon was thought to express his attitude toward the person represented, and so the faithful were accustomed to bringing flowers, candles, and incense to their icons, carrying them in procession and as part of liturgical rites kissing them.

In 726 Emperor Leo III declared all images were idols and ordered their destruction. His reason for this action has remained a puzzle, but historians often suggest that it was due to Monophysite influence. Some Byzantines, especially those from eastern Syria (homeland of Leo III), looked with suspicion on things physical, and they believed a likeness of God or Christ painted on a board, or any emphasis on the humanity of the saints, was Judaistic and blasphemous. Another motive may have been political, as Leo tried by this means to gain greater control over the church and especially over the multitude of monks, most of whom were strongly attached to their icons. A persecution of "iconodules" ("idol worshipers," as their opponents labelled them), was unleashed, but strong support for the use of icons in worship came from John of Damascus.

> It is disastrous to suppose that the Church does not know God as He is, that she degenerates into idolatry, for if she declines from perfection in a single iota, it is as an enduring mark on a comely face . . . . You see, the one thing to be aimed at is not to adore a created thing more than the Creator, nor to give worship of *latreia* except to Him alone. By worship, consequently, He [God] always understands the worship of *latreia* . . . . These injunctions were given to the Jews on account of their proneness to idolatry . . . . We have passed the stage of infancy and reached the perfection of manhood . . . . When He who is a pure spirit, without form or limit . . . existing as God, takes . . . the form of a servant in substance and stature

> . . . then you may draw His likeness, and show it to anyone willing to contemplate it . . . . worship is not all of the same kind . . . . The worship of *latreia* is one thing, and the worship which is given to merit another . . . . Do not despise matter, for it is not despicable . . . . What a book is to the literate, that an image is to the illiterate . . . . You who refuse to worship images would not worship the Son of God, the Living Image of the invisible God, and His unchanging form. "Honoring the image leads to [honoring] the prototype."[11]

Pope Gregory III held two synods at Rome condemning Leo's action (731), but many monks in the East became martyrs in the cause of icons. In 787, under the regent Irene, the Seventh Ecumenical Council at Nicea reversed Leo's policy and permitted icons to receive *doulia* (veneration). Unfortunately, Charlemagne received a faulty translation (or interpretation) of these proceedings, and in his Caroline Books of 794 he condemned the council, though later popes and theologians accepted it as orthodox and ecumenical.[12] Shortly after Irene's regency the controversy broke out afresh, but in 843 another woman, the regent Theodora, reaffirmed the decisions of 787, thus bringing the issue to a close. The first Sunday in Lent has since been observed by the churches in the East in honor of icons and in recognition of the end of the controversy as the "Great Feast of Orthodoxy."

During the height of the iconoclastic affair there occurred an event in the West which profoundly affected the relationship between the churches. This was the coronation of Charlemagne in 800. Until the 8th century Western Christians had generally acknowledged the fact of a united empire under the Eastern ruler. The popes shared this view, although they often disagreed with imperial interference in ecclesiastical affairs. In 751 the pope sanctioned the overthrow of the Merovingians by Pepin, and subsequent popes looked to the Franks for military support against the Lombards in Italy rather than to the impotent representative of the Eastern emperor who lived in Ravenna (the exarch). The coronation of Charlemagne in effect reestablished the Western empire, further aggravating the tensions with the

East, and the popes effectively severed whatever ties remained between them and the Eastern rulers. Whereas the papacy had heretofore been subject to the emperor, by creating a new emperor the popes could and did insist that the church was superior to the state.

In 858 Emperor Michael III deposed the patriarch Ignatius, replacing him with the greatest intellect of his age, Photius. Both sides appealed to Pope Nicholas I, whose legates sided with the emperor and acquiesced in Photius' elevation, but the pope himself reversed their action and said Ignatius was still the lawful patriarch. Photius responded by issuing a strong condemnation of the Latins in general and of the pope in particular, whom he anathematized and excommunicated. His letter, sent to all the Eastern archbishops, listed the doctrinal aberrations of the West.

> It is not permissible to say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, but from the Father alone . . . . The first unlawful practice they have set up is fasting on Saturday. Such slight regard for the traditional teaching usually leads to the complete abandonment of the entire doctrine . . . . They taught them to despise the priest living in lawful matrimony and by rejecting matrimony spread the seed of Manichaeism, while they themselves practiced adultery . . . . They claim that bishops only have the right to confirm, but who made this law? Which apostle, which father of the Church, which synod made it? . . . They are preaching a novel doctrine: that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Father alone, but from the Son as well . . . if all other false teachings were not present, this alone would be enough to bring ten thousand anathemas upon them.[13]

Pope Nicholas answered in kind with a letter to the bishops of the West:

> As regards the procession of the Holy Spirit—who does not know that distinguished men, especially among the Latins, have written much about this matter? Supported by their authority we can reply fully and reasonably to their senselessness. Does any custom demand that they should go unrefuted, or that we should not answer their yelps and disputatious tongues with reasonable argument?

> Is it even strange that they should allege such things since they even glory in the assertion that when the emperors moved from Rome to Constantinople the primacy of the Roman See also went to Constantinople, and with the royal dignities even the privileges of the Roman Church were transferred? So that this same Photius, a usurper in the Church, even entitles himself in his writings, "archbishop and universal patriarch."[14]

Meanwhile a question arose whether Bulgaria should be evangelized by Rome or Constantinople. Ignatius was restored as patriarch when Basil succeeded Michael III, and there was a short time of peace. But when Ignatius began to consecrate bishops in Bulgaria, he was denounced by the pope as intruding upon Roman jurisdiction. When Ignatius died in 877, Photius was again appointed patriarch, this time with papal approval. In 886 Photius was again deposed, and he disappears from history.

The Photian schism brought to prominence the *filioque* question, in which the East retained the original wording of the Nicene Creed, which declared that the Holy Spirit proceeded "from the Father," but the West had added the words, "and the Son" *(filioque)*. So long as the West insisted on the use of this word, a lasting peace was impossible. The issue also underscored the different attitudes of the two churches toward dogma, with Rome holding to a more fluid interpretation which permitted additions to creeds, while the East approached dogma as a fixed body of teaching which permitted no change.[15]

One cannot help but marvel that the two great centers of Christendom should have allowed minute questions of practice to disrupt fellowship. A few years after the Photian affair the pope and the patriarch once again broke off communion over the question whether a man may marry a fourth time even though his first three wives were dead. The truth is that the real reasons for controversy were basically not religious but cultural, sociological, political, and often personal. As time went on, an added irritant was Rome's insistence on primacy over Constantinople.

The final melancholy scene between East and West took place in 1054 when the Eastern patriarch, Michael Cerularius,

published a manifesto accusing the Latins of four errors: (1) the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, (2) the custom of fasting on Saturdays, (3) the eating of meat of strangled animals, and (4) the practice of forbidding the Alleluiah in Lent. Two further complaints were the use of the *filioque* and the papal enforcement of celibacy on the priesthood. Cerularius closed the Latin churches in Constantinople and ordered the Latin monasteries to conform to Greek usages. Pope Leo IX (1049–1054) protested by contending that Rome was superior to all other churches, and the Greeks were being permitted their aberrations only by sufferance. The pope sent three legates to Constantinople to discuss their differences, but they were received with insolence. The patriarch ordered the pope's name removed from the diptychs, and in retaliation the papal legates on July 16, 1054, laid on the altar of St. Sophia a sentence of anathema against Cerularius and his followers: "Let them be Anathema Maranatha, with Simoniacs, Valerians, Arians, Donatists, Nicolaitans, Severians, Pneumatomachi, Manichees, Nazarenes, and with all other heretics, yea with the devil and his angels. Amen. Amen. Amen." [16] Four days later the patriarch in turn excommunicated the pope, and the schism thus begun has continued to the present.

The Fourth Crusade in 1204 (see below) saw a temporary and artificial reunion of the churches when the Latins conquered and sacked Constantinople, but so deep was the Greek resentment that when they drove out the Latins in 1261 the breach was virtually complete.

Greek representatives attended the Council of Lyons in 1274. Prompted by their fear of Charles of Anjou, who threatened to become the Eastern emperor, they agreed to the *filioque* and to the primacy of Rome. When the representatives returned to Constantinople, however, the danger had passed, and the Eastern Church refused to ratify the agreements made at Lyons. Attempts at reunion continued to be made. Between 1054 and 1438 negotiations with this object in view were conducted on approximately 30 occasions. In 1438 the Turks were approaching Constantinople, and the Greeks once again sought support from the West. In that year a council in Florence was attended by the Eastern

emperor and the patriarch in person. Agreement was reached on most issues, but discussions on the *filioque* continued for over 3 months. The primacy of the papacy was also a stumbling block. A Decree of Union was finally signed in July 1439, but so strong was popular opposition to it in Constantinople that it was never ratified by the Orthodox synods. After the capture of Constantinople by the Turks further negotiations for reunion became impossible.

CRUSADES

For centuries the East Romans had managed to maintain an uneasy truce with the Moslems, but in 1055 Baghdad was occupied by the militant Seljuk Turks who were determined to push westward as far as possible. In 1071 the Byzantines were routed at the battle of Manzikert, and the same year saw the occupation of Jerusalem by these new Moslem intruders. Emperor Michael VII appealed to Pope Gregory VII for help, but he was too deeply embroiled in the investiture controversy with Henry IV of Germany to provide assistance. During the next quarter century the Turks pushed on to Nicea, which lay at the very gates of Constantinople itself, and again a plea went out for help. Pope Urban II responded with his famous call for the First Crusade at the Council of Clermont in 1095:

> You must carry succor to your brethren dwelling in the East, and needing your aid, which they have so often demanded. For the Turks, a Persian people, have attacked them as many of you know, and have advanced into the territory of Romania as far as . . . (The Hellespont) and, occupying more and more the lands of those Christians, have already seven times conquered them in battle, have killed and captured many, have destroyed the churches and devastated the kingdom of God . . . . Wherefore I pray and exhort . . . you . . . to hasten to exterminate this vile race from the lands of our brethren and to bear timely aid to the worshippers of Christ . . . . Moreover, the sins of those who set out thither, if they lose their lives on the journey, by land or sea, or in fighting against the heathen, shall be remitted in that hour . . . .[17]

The pope shrewdly reminded his listeners that the land "flows with milk and honey like another paradise of delights," and that France, suffering from famine that year, was "too narrow for your population." The response was enthusiastic and instantaneous. The crowd shouted, "Deus vult" ("It is God's will"), which became their battle cry, and many tore strips from their clothing to place the sign of the cross upon themselves, the badge of a crusader.

Such was the enthusiasm of the people that many of them refused to wait for the campaign to organize, and about 50,000 peasants, including entire families with small children, followed the leadership of two bizarre characters, Walter the Penniless and Peter the Hermit. As they proceeded through Germany they inquired at each town whether it might be Jerusalem, but as they went they also ravaged the countryside, incurring the hostility of the residents. Their vendetta against the infidel found expression in the massacre of thousands of Jews in Speyer, Mainz, Worms, and Cologne. In Bulgaria the disorganized crusaders were mercilessly attacked, and upon arriving at Nicea the remnant was exterminated by the Turks.

The main van under the leadership of several French princes arrived at Constantinople in 1096. The residents of the city looked with some amusement on this band of unlikely warriors, mostly drawn from French farms. The emperor's daughter, Anna Comnena, has left us her impressions of Byzantium's would-be saviors:

> . . . the whole of the West and all the barbarian tribes which dwell between the farther side of the Adriatic and the pillars of Heracles, had all migrated in a body and were marching into Asia through the intervening Europe, and were making the journey with all their household . . . . and persons of intelligence felt they were witnessing a strange occurrence . . . . Now the Frankish counts are naturally shameless and violent, naturally greedy of money too, and immoderate in everything they wish, and possess a flow of language greater than any other human race . . . . And when they came in [to see the emperor] they did not regulate their conversation by a waterglass, as the rule was for orators formerly, but for as long as

> each wished to talk to the emperor . . . for so long he was allowed to talk . . . . even when evening came, the emperor who had remained without food all through the day, rose from his throne to retire to his bedroom, but not even then was he freed from their chatter.[18]

The Franks were overwhelmed by the glitter of the city, its churches, statues, wide streets, fountains, and the accumulated culture of centuries. Finally they moved on, and in June 1097 they invested Nicea and recaptured it from the Turks, though the Moslems insisted on surrendering to the emperor rather than fall into the hands of the Franks. From there they pushed on toward Antioch, but Baldwin, one of the leaders, managed to slip over to Edessa near the headwaters of the Euphrates River, where he married the daughter of the prince of Edessa and succeeded his father-in-law to the throne. This County of Edessa became one of the four crusader states. Antioch was besieged from October 1097 to June 1098, when it fell to the crusaders, but no sooner had they taken it than the Turks in turn besieged them. The fortuitous discovery of the lance which had pierced Christ's side gave them the courage to sally forth and rout the besiegers. Bohemond of Tarento and his followers decided to stay in Antioch, and so established the second crusader state, the Principality of Antioch. Only a remnant finally arrived in Jerusalem and captured it in July 1099, taking the holy city amidst carnage and destruction. A letter to Pope Paschal II describes the event:

> He [God] delivered the city and His enemies to us . . . . And if you desire to know what was done with the enemy who were found there, know that in Solomon's Porch and in his temple our men rode in the blood of the Saracens up to the knees of their horses.[19]

A chronicler of the crusade, Fulcher of Chartres, maintained that 10,000 Turks were killed. Baldwin of Edessa was elected "Protector of the Holy Sepulchre," and on Christmas Day 1100 the new Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem came into being. A few years later the County of Tripoli on the coast was established as the fourth crusader state. Collectively

these territories were known in Europe as "Outremer," the land "beyond the seas," and for two centuries they were Christendom's eastern perimeter. However, the crusaders had succeeded only in establishing themselves along a narrow strip of Palestinian coastline. Inland the Turks were still masters, and they provided a constant threat to the new Latin states.

In order to meet this threat and to protect the many pilgrims who now flocked to Palestine, two religious orders came into being. The Knights Templar (so called after Solomon's temple) were founded in 1118 by Hugo of Payens to defend Jerusalem against a recapture by the Moslems. In 1128 Bernard of Clairvaux gave them a form of the Cistercian Rule. They were in effect soldier-monks who took the same vows as monks with the additional obligation of fighting for Christianity, thus combining in themselves the twin medieval ideals of knightly chivalry with monasticism. The Knights Hospitaller were organized to defend pilgrims and to tend those who became sick. A third order, that of the Teutonic Knights, was founded in 1189. During the late Middle Ages this order was primarily responsible for the evangelization and organization of Prussia.

Once the crusaders had settled down in the East, the inevitable process of cultural assimilation began. They were attracted to the more leisurely style of life of the "infidel." They adopted flowing silk robes, became fond of steam baths, wore turbans, and through social contacts and intermarriage learned to know and admire their erstwhile enemy. The cleric Fulcher of Chartres wrote, "He who was a Roman or Frank . . . has become a Galilean or Palestinian . . . . We have already forgotten our birthplaces."[20] When later crusaders arrived in Palestine, they were shocked and chagrined at the indifference toward the Turk displayed by the earlier campaigners, and more often than once the first-generation warriors sided with the Moslems against their zealous cousins who arrived some years later.

Europe was galvanized into the Second Crusade when Edessa fell in 1144. Two monarchs participated; Louis VII of France, Conrad III of Germany, and Bernard of Clairvaux's rhetoric popularized it. Despite such impressive

support, it accomplished nothing except the capture of Lisbon in Portugal by some German sailors who seized this opportunity of fighting Moslems nearer home.

In 1187 a powerful Saracen leader, Saladin, recaptured Jerusalem, and Europe's three strongest monarchs were moved to lead the forces of counteraction. Frederick Barbarossa drowned enroute to the Holy Land, Philip II of France became disgusted at the indifference of the first generation crusaders and returned home, and Richard I ("the Lionhearted") of England managed to negotiate a truce which permitted pilgrims to visit the holy places unmolested.

After this crusade Europe tired of these ventures. The West itself was expanding internally and intellectually, and the emergence of a new urban culture closer to home diverted the Latins' attention. In fact, no crusade ever equalled the popular support (and results) achieved in the First Crusade. All subsequent campaigns were for the purpose of reestablishing territories gained in the initial effort of 1098.

Byzantium gained little from the crusades except a brief respite from Turkish attack. The behavior of the Franks in Asia Minor led some Byzantines to wonder whether the Turks themselves might not be more desirable as neighbors, but the Franks in turn had reason to complain of the duplicity of Byzantium. The most tragic of all crusades for its long-term effect was the Fourth. Innocent III succeeded in gathering an army to recapture the holy places of Palestine, but the Venetians whose ships were to transport the army convinced the Latins to divert their course to Constantinople, which in 1204 they pillaged for 3 days. They forced the Byzantines to accept a Latin patriarch and to observe Latin rites until 1261, when the Greeks finally drove them out. A respected authority in Byzantine history has observed:

> It is hard to exaggerate the harm done to European civilization by the sack of Constantinople. The treasures of the City, the books and works of art preserved from distant centuries, were all dispersed and most destroyed. The Empire, the great Eastern bulwark of Christendom, was broken as a power. Its highly centralized organization was ruined. Provinces, to save themselves, were forced into devolution. The conquests of the Ottoman [Turks] were made possible by the Crusaders' crime.[21]

In 1229 the colorful Frederick II succeeded in negotiating a truce with the Sultan whereby Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Nazareth would be open to Christian pilgrims. This, the most successful "crusade" after the first, was undertaken by an excommunicate without shedding a drop of blood.

Two attempts at recovering the holy places were undertaken by King Louis IX of France. Both in 1248 and in 1270 he sought to defeat the Moslems by attacking Egypt, the seat of their power at the time. In the first venture he was taken captive, and in the second he died of dysentery at Tunis.

In 1291 the forces of Islam took Acre, the last stronghold of the Christians in the Holy Land, and the period of the crusades was over.

Few can discount the significance of the crusades in bringing the West into contact with civilizations of the East. They stimulated commerce, broadened intellectual horizons, served as an outlet for surplus population, gave peasants status, provided land for the landless, and were a primary stimulant in leading Europe out of feudalism. Although they attracted rogues and adventurers whose conduct belied the ideals of the cross for which they contended, there were also innumerable simple folk who believed it was God's will that the Holy Land be rescued from the infidels. In this sense the crusades were an expression of profound albeit misguided faith. The cost was high, not only in lives and bloodshed but also in the fragmentation of the church. Following the notorious Fourth Crusade, any rapprochement between Byzantium and the West was impossible. Weakened by this disaster, Constantinople fell to the Ottoman Turks in 1453, and Eastern Christianity to this day bears the scars of this unhappy event.

NOTES—CHAPTER 5

1. Procopius, *Buildings* I, 1, trans. H. B. Dewing, Loeb Classical Library, cited in *The Eagle, the Crescent, and the Cross*, ed. Charles T. Davis (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967), p. 108.
2. Procopius, *Buildings* I, 2, in Davis, p. 110.
3. Constantine VII, *On Administering the Empire* I, trans. R. J. H. Jenkins, in Davis, p. 139.

4. Michael Psellus, *Chronographie*, in Philip Sherrard, *Byzantium*, Great Ages of Man (New York: Time-Life Books, 1966), p. 62.
5. Cf. Ch. 1, p. 31.
6. Leo VI, *Epanagoge*, in Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantine East and Latin West* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966), p. 56.
7. Leo III, *Eclaga*, pref., in J. M. Hussey, *The Byzantine World* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), p. 86.
8. This is the interpretation of Deno J. Geanakoplos, "Church and State in the Byzantine Empire: A Reconsideration of the Problem of Caesaropapism," *Church History* XXXIV, No. 4 (December 1965), 381–403.
9. John of Damascus, *The Orthodox Faith* III. 4, trans. Chase, in *Readings in Christian Thought*, ed. High Kerr (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 71–72.
10. Steven Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization* (London: Edward Arnold, 1933), pp. 134–135.
11. John of Damascus, . . . *On Holy Images*, in Colman Barry, *Readings in Church History* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960), pp. 309, 310, 312, 313.
12. For Charlemagne's views see Ch. 3, p. 71.
13. Photius, "Encyclical Letter . . ." (866), in Barry, pp. 316–318.
14. Nicholas I, *Letter to Hincmar and Bishops of the West* (867), in Barry, p. 321.
15. See Ch. 3, pp. 71–72, on *filioque* question in the West.
16. In W. R. Cannon, *History of Christianity in the Middle Ages* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 155. The second Vatican Council (1963 to 1965) addressed itself to the schism in the Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches. The decree goes far in its positive and irenic intentions. The Orthodox churches have received it with rejoicing, yet express some reserve because of its apparent assumption to legislate for the East. The existence of the Uniat churches constitutes another obstacle to complete harmony. As a gesture of good faith, Pope Paul VI and Patriarch Athanagoras on Dec. 7, 1965, in solemn ceremonies at St. Peter's and in Instanbul, nullified the actions of their predecessors in 1054, thus opening the way for free discussion.
17. Urban II, *Call to First Crusade* (1095), in Barry, pp. 327–328.
18. Anna Comnena, "A Greek View of the Crusaders," *Alexiad*, in *The Portable Medieval Reader*, ed. J. B. Ross and M. M. McLaughlin (New York: Viking Press, c. 1949, 11th printing, 1960), pp. 444–446.
19. Arch. Daimbert, Duke Godfrey, Count Raymon, *Letter to Paschal II* (1099), in Barry, p. 330.
20. Fulcher of Chartres, *Age of Faith*, ed. Anne Fremantle, Great Ages of Man (New York: Time-Life, 1965), p. 58.
21. Runciman, pp. 54–55.

CHAPTER 6 •

DISSENT AND REFORM

IDEA OF REFORM

Christianity has always carried within itself the dynamic of reform. It is clear that Christ and the apostles insisted on a new standard of behavior for converts to the faith. This lofty ethical ideal has continually called men to a reexamination of their personal morality and to a reform when it was necessary. This has also been true of the church as an institution, especially when its practices have appeared to be in flagrant violation of Christian ideals. The process of continual reform has also been evident in the area of teaching, and each generation of believers has sought to assure itself that the dogma of the church truly reflects the apostolic witness of the New Testament. When teaching appeared to be inconsistent with orthodox Christian tradition, reforms were called for. Dissenters and reformers were by no means uniformly orthodox themselves, however, and occasionally the church found it necessary to reject the reforms themselves as innovations contrary to the Gospel (e. g., Joachim of Fiore, the Albigensians). The medieval church was *ecclesia semper reformanda* (the church always to be reformed) both in areas of life and faith.

One institution of reform was the church council, where bishops and other leaders met to discuss the affairs of a diocese, province, nation, or on rare occasions of the entire church. We have already discussed the Council of Orange in 529 (Ch. 3—Teaching), which rejected Pelagian ideas and restored Augustine's doctrine of grace. Pepin, father of Charlemagne, convened numerous councils to reform and organize the church. Excerpts from these synodal decrees reveal their general nature:

> We have ordered that a synod shall be held every year, so that in our presence the canonical decrees and the laws of the Church may be reestablished and the Christian religion purified. . . . We have decreed . . . that every bishop . . . shall see to it that the people of God perform no pagan rites but reject and cast out the foulness of the heathen, such as sacrifices to the dead, casting of lots, divinations, amulets and auguries . . . which foolish folk perform in the churches . . . in the name of holy martyrs or confessors . . . . [It was decided] . . . that monasteries, whether of men or virgins . . . should live according to their rule . . . and if they fail to do so the bishop in his diocese should correct them. . . . If the bishop cannot correct them they should appear before the synod and receive a canonical sentence. And if the bishop holds the synod in contempt . . . he will . . . be excommunicated by all the bishops.[1]

Charlemagne called no less than 33 councils to deal with the problem of clerical discipline. Priests were admonished to teach the people, hear confessions, visit the sick, and preach. If they were unable to prepare sermons, the government supplied them with copies prepared by scholars, which priests were to memorize and deliver in the language of the people. A significant council was held at Kiersey in 853 which reaffirmed the Augustinian doctrine of grace. The council declared:

> A good and just God elected man from the mass of perdition according to His foreknowledge. He foreknew that others would perish, but He did not predestine that they should perish. By grace man's will has been set free and by grace healed from a corrupt state. That some perish is the desert of those who perish. Christ died for all. That His death does not set all free is the fault of those who are still unbelieving, or who do not believe with the faith that works by love.[2]

Perhaps the best-known medieval councils were those four held in the Lateran Palace in Rome which rank as ecumenical. The First Lateran Council (1123) not only confirmed the Concordat of Worms which ended the Investiture controversy, but its 22 canons covered all the social and religious problems of the day. They especially legislated against the

control of the church by lay princes, and the horrors of war were mitigated by the "Truce of God" which declared that Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays between Trinity and Advent were the only lawful days for fighting. The Second Lateran Council (1139) issued numerous canons on organization, but two have to do with belief. Canon 22 instructs bishops to tell their people that outward acts of penance without a corresponding inward repentance are hypocrisy, and canon 23 condemns those who reject the Eucharist, infant baptism, priesthood, and marriage; these it calls heretics who are on the road to hell. The Third Lateran Council (1179) declared that a two-thirds majority of the cardinals constituted a valid papal election, but, perhaps more important, it ordered that each bishop should appoint a scholar to teach gratis those clerics of the diocese and poor students who wanted an education. By thus establishing the office of *scholasticus* this council elevated the general competence of parish priests. The fourth was the most important of the Lateran councils (1215). In the reform of canon law this council is second in importance only to Trent among the 20 general councils. Its 70 canons include a statement of belief drawn up against the heresies of the time (Albigensianism and pantheism), a declaration that bishops who permit scandals in the church are to lose their office forever, and that clergy are to be soberly dressed, their garments neither too long or too short, fastened to the neck—not of red or green cloth. Clerical participation in ordeals was prohibited, since the church considered them to be pagan. This council also set forth the inquisitorial procedures to put down heresy:

> Every archbishop or bishop should himself or through his archdeacon or some other suitable persons, twice or at least once a year make the rounds of his diocese in which report has it that heretics dwell, and there compel three or more men of good character or, if it should be deemed advisable, the entire neighborhood, to swear that if anyone there know of the presence of heretics or others holding secret assemblies, or differing from the common way of the faithful in faith and morals, they will make them known to the bishop.[3]

If the accused heretic did not renounce his error, he was excommunicated. The council declared that Christians should receive the Eucharist at least every Easter, which seems to indicate that many were receiving Communion less than once each year. An interesting canon sheds light on the pastoral nature of the confessional, which apparently was also in need of reform:

> Let the priest be discreet and cautious that he may pour wine and oil into the wounds of the one injured [i. e., sinner] after the manner of a skillful physician, carefully inquiring into the circumstances of the sinner and the sin, from the nature of which he may understand what kind of advice to give and what remedy to apply, making use of different experiments to heal the sick one. But let him exercise the greatest precaution that he does not in any degree by word, sign, or other manner make known the sinner . . . . He who dares to reveal a sin confided to him . . . shall be deposed . . . but . . . do penance for the remainder of his life [in a monastery].[4]

Canonical visitation by bishops and abbots was another institution for reform in the church. Each bishop (sometimes abbots for religious orders) was required to visit every parish church and other ecclesiastical establishments in his diocese at least once every 3 years, and to keep a record of his findings (cf. Ch. 2, p. 47). In each place he inquired into the conduct of the services, the spiritual life of the pastor and people, the physical condition of the properties, and the financial situation. The records of these visitations list only such items as required reform. When all was found to be in order, a simple notation was made to this effect. Some critics of the medieval church have relied heavily on these accounts in writing their histories, with the inevitable result of presenting a distorted picture of medieval society based, in effect, on police court records. The very existence of such records indicates that many prelates discharged their pastoral responsibilities with diligence and evangelical concern.

RELIGIOUS ORDERS

Part of the historic genius of Christianity has been its ability to create new forms of life and ministry in response

to the needs of the time. Cluny was such a creation. During the two centuries of anarchy and dissolution which followed the death of Charlemagne in 814, the church suffered from the control of self-seeking princes. The papacy, far from exercising a beneficent influence on the church, reached its nadir during the 10th century. Reformation was not to be expected from this quarter. The monks of Cluny recognized that a prior condition for reform was the dissociation of the church from control by the state, and it was to this task that the Order of Cluny addressed itself. Rather than seek the Christian ideal by fleeing from the world, it infused the ideal into the world. The order was founded in 910 by Berno of Baume, and by the mid-12th century there were 314 monasteries under Cluny's supervision with more than 1,500 affiliates. The document which brought this order into being is significant, for it established the right of the church to exist independently of king or prince *(existens sine rege et principe)*. Cluny also fostered a reform within monasticism itself, recalling the monks to the discipline of worshiping God.

But Cluny's very success proved its undoing, and two centuries after its foundation it was in need of reform. By the end of the 11th century Europe was emerging from agrarian feudalism into an age of commercial expansion. With the influx of wealth came a corresponding decline in the values which had been attached to poverty and simplicity. Once again renewal came from the cloister, this time from the Cistercian Order founded in 1098 in Burgundy. These monks recalled the church to her pilgrim ideal of being in the world but not of the world. They symbolically underscored this ideal by founding their houses in remote spots—in marshes, swamps, deep forests, and isolated valleys. In doing this they tended to expand the internal frontiers of Europe by creating more arable land. But their role in society was only secondary to their effect on the church. Every Cistercian house became a missionary center. The "white monks," by their frugality and simplicity, were a living denunciation of the materialism of the 12th century. Their emphasis on simplicity can be seen reflected in their foundation charter, here described by one of their first abbots:

> In order that in the house of God, in which it was their desire to serve God devoutly day and night, nothing would remain that savored pride and superfluity or eventually corrupt poverty, the safeguard of virtues, which they had chosen out of their free will, they resolved not to keep golden or silver crosses but only painted wooden ones; no candelabra, but only one of iron; no thuribles, but only of copper or iron; no chasubles, except of wool or linen, without silk, gold, or silver weave; no albs or amices but of linen, similarly without silk, gold, or silver [weave]. They eliminated entirely the use of all kinds of palliums, copes, dalmatics, and tunics. . . . They also ordered that the altar cloths be made of plain linen and without embroideries.[5]

Ninth-century England witnessed an almost total eclipse of ordered Christian life as the marauding Danes swept everything before them. Monasteries were plundered and burned, churches were destroyed, and the eastern half of the island seemed doomed to revert to primitive paganism. Through the efforts of Alfred, king of Wessex, a truce was signed which permitted the rebuilding of the church. Once again the task of reform fell to the monks, notably the houses of Abingdon, Westbury, and Glastonbury under the leadership of Oswald, Ethelwold, and Dunstan. From a meeting of the English church leaders at Winchester in 970 there emerged the *Regularis Concordia*, a lengthy reform document which thereafter continued to influence the relationship between church and state to the time of Henry VIII. All three of these monks were also bishops, and they were instrumental in restoring an ordered scheme of Christian life to England. "They did everything: they called the dead to life; they created a great and flourishing system upon vacant soil; and to Dunstan especially, as to Augustine of Canterbury before him, are due in a very real sense the titles of patron and father of the monks of medieval England."[6]

TWELFTH CENTURY

The urban and commercial renaissance of the 12th century was but one facet of a general revival of society.

These years also witnessed a rebirth of arts and letters which rivals that of the better-known 16th-century renaissance, and, like its later counterpart, the intellectual ferment stimulated critical reappraisals of Christian faith and life.

Perhaps the most famous dissenters of this century were the Waldensians. We can get an idea of their main tenets through the observations of one of their chief opponents who wrote early in the 14th century.

> The sect and heresy of the Waldensians began in about the year 1170 A. D. Its founder was a certain citizen of Lyons, named . . . Waldo, from whom his followers were named. He was a rich man, who, after having given up all his wealth, determined to observe poverty and evangelical perfection, in imitation of the apostles. He caused to be translated into the French tongue . . . the Gospels and some other books of the Bible, and also some authoritative sayings of Saints Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose and Gregory. . . . They usurped the office of the apostles, and presumed to preach the Gospel in the streets and public places. And the said Waldes . . . converted many people, both men and women. . . . They scorned the prelates and the clergy, because they abounded in riches and lived in pleasantness. . . .
>
> They hold and teach that all oaths . . . are forbidden by God. . . . [They do] not accept or consider valid the canonical sanctions and the decretals and constitutions of the supreme pontiffs, and the regulations concerning fasts, and the celebration of feast days, and the decrees of the fathers . . . . [They hear] the confessions of the men and women who wish to confess to them and be absolved and have penances imposed on them. . . . [They declare that] indulgences . . . are worthless. . . . in the sacrament of the altar [they believe] the bread and wine do not become the body and blood of Christ if the priest . . . is a sinner . . . the consecration may be made by any just person.[7]

It is clear from this account that the Waldensians rejected clerical and papal authority and hoped to return to a simpler form of Christianity which stressed preaching, reading the Bible in the vernacular, and a minimum of ecclesiastical organization. They also rejected purgatory, veneration of

saints, and the dietary regulations governing fasts. The episcopate, threatened by this attack, considered them heretical. An appeal for recognition at the Third Lateran Council (1179) failed, and in 1184 they were placed under the ban by the pope. The Waldensians then organized themselves as a separate body, largely centered in southern France, having their own clergy and style of life. Under the Inquisition they were attacked together with the Albigensians, but, unlike the latter, their organization has continued to the present. Their membership today is about 20,000.

While the Waldensians represented a genuine reform movement stemming from Christianity itself, a group known as the Albigensians (from their chief city, Albi, in southern France) took its inspiration from non-Christian sources, principally the ancient heresy of Manicheism. They believed that there were two eternal principles, of good and of evil. Everything in this world which was material, including man's body, was evil, and only that which was nonmaterial was considered good. Not only did this dualism deny the ultimate supremacy of God, since the principle of evil (i. e., Satan) was coeternal with Him, but it excluded God from the world of matter and of man. Thus it denied Christ's incarnation, the reality of His death, and the resurrection of the body. The Albigensians (also called Cathari—the pure ones) condemned marriage, the use of meat, milk, eggs, and other animal produce, and recommended a form of austerity *(endura)* which, if followed rigorously, would have led to suicide. The new sect was divided into the "perfect," who attempted to observe all the rules in their fullness, and the "believers," who were less severe in their habits. Obviously they were anticlerical and hostile to the church. It is a disputed question whether they should be included among dissenters and reformers of the church, or whether they stood outside the church altogether. Their attacks on ecclesiastical wealth and clerical hypocrisy, however, gained for them the support and sympathy of many orthodox Christians.

The Albigensians were condemned by several councils culminating in a general excommunication by the Fourth Lateran Council. Innocent III attempted to reconcile them

to the church by sending several Cistercian missionaries to southern France, and later St. Dominic visited the area; but when a papal emissary was murdered by the Cathari in 1208, the pope preached a crusade against them. It was in opposition to the Albigensians that the famous medieval inquisition was developed. After 20 years of almost uninterrupted warfare, the Albigensians were crushed, but at the cost of much bloodshed accompanied by gross acts of perfidy on both sides, and southern France took centuries to recover from the ravages of the crusade.

The latter half of the 12th century witnessed the growth of pantheism, which was implicit in the tradition of the school of Chartres. Two main exponents of this heresy, Amaury of Bene and David of Dinant, were condemned at Paris in 1210 and again at the Fourth Lateran Council, together with some of Aristotle's works which were becoming popular among the Paris theologians.

Joachim of Fiore (d. 1202) shared the pantheism of Amaury and David in that he believed God was actively present in nature as well as history. He divided the history of the world into three epochs according to the Trinity. The first age of the world, that of the Father, corresponded to the Old Testament and was an age of fear under the Law; the second, that of the Son, was the age of the church under grace, the New Testament, which was to last 42 generations; the third, the age of the Spirit, was to begin about 1260 and would be an age of love in which all men would dwell together in peace. Although Joachim never pressed his third age to the point of anticlericalism, his ideas inspired the later Spiritual Franciscans and Fraticelli to stress the role of spiritual men as opposed to the clergy. The Fourth Lateran Council condemned his ideas on the Trinity, and in 1265 his central teachings were condemned by Alexander IV.

THE FRIARS

Europe underwent a socioeconomic crisis with the further development of commerce and the rise of cities. The multitudes who flocked to the new urban centers found free-

dom from direct feudal obligations and opportunities for personal advancement. However, the church of the Middle Ages, like most other institutions of the time, was based on an agrarian economy. Neither the monastery of the 12th century nor the rural parish any longer exercised the influence they had enjoyed in earlier ages. The church was also losing its struggle for the minds of the educated, who crowded around teachers in the emerging universities. At this critical juncture in its history the church received help from the new religious orders, notably the Franciscans and the Dominicans. Preaching and pastoral care had fallen to a pitifully low estate among the secular clergy, and the universities tended to foster a secular gospel which called into question truths that had been held to be absolute for nearly a millenium. The clergy and hierarchy were embroiled in a struggle with powerful nobles and kings to keep a firm hold on their landed estates. The papacy, too, was involved in an unhappy conflict with the rulers of the young national states, a struggle which resulted in the Great Schism. The friars represented a new form of ministry to deal with the new situation.

Francis of Assisi (d. 1226), son of a wealthy merchant, became dissatisfied with his aimless life of leisure and during a serious illness determined to devote the rest of his life to the service of the poor. During a trip to Rome he exchanged his clothes with a beggar and spent the day begging for alms. This experience confirmed him in his resolve. Although his father disowned him, Francis succeeded in gathering a number of like-minded friends who took the name "friars minor" or little brothers (O. F. M.—*ordo fratres minores*). From the color of their habit they have also become known as Greyfriars. Pope Innocent III confirmed the new order in 1209 to 1210. The brothers devoted themselves to serving the poor and dispossessed in the ghettos of the new urban centers in addition to reviving the art of preaching. The Second Rule of the Franciscans (1223) reflects their ideals:

> [Let those who wish to join us] sell all their goods and strive to distribute them to the poor. If they should not be able to do this, their good will suffices. And the brothers . . . must take care not to be solicitous about their temporal affairs, that they may freely do with their affairs whatsoever the Lord may

> inspire them. . . . I indeed counsel, warn, and exhort my brothers in the Lord Jesus Christ that when they go through the world they be not litigious nor contend in words, nor judge others; but that they be gentle, peaceful, and modest, meek and humble, speaking honestly all that is fitting. . . . The brothers shall appropriate nothing to themselves, neither a house nor place nor anything. And as pilgrims and strangers in this world, serving the Lord in poverty and humility, let them go confidently in quest of alms, nor ought they to be ashamed, because the Lord made Himself poor for us in this world.[8]

In 1212 these ideals were espoused by a noble lady of Assisi, Clare, who became the founder of the St. Clares or female branch of the Franciscans. Foreign mission work was also part of the Franciscan agenda, and the founder himself traveled through Spain, Egypt, and eastern Europe evangelizing the Moslems. The Franciscans were not so much reformers as innovators, creating a new force in the church to minister to the spiritual and physical needs of a new society.

Dominic of Guzman (d. 1221), founder of the Order of Friars Preachers (O. P.—*ordo praedicatorum*) or Blackfriars, was a native of Old Castille in Spain. For many years he labored in Albigensian territories, striving to recall the heretical sect to the church through the arts of preaching and persuasion. In 1216 he received papal sanction for the new order, which henceforth devoted itself to serving the intellectual needs of the church. Dominican houses were established at all the major university centers of Europe, and Dominican preachers were everywhere in demand.

Because of their popularity, the friars were not always welcomed by parish priests. Clearly one reason for this was the fact that the friars generally outshone the priests in the art of preaching, in pastoral counseling via the confessional, and in piety. An anonymous treatise gives vent to a cleric's complaint:

> Here are men who seek to forestall the clergy in their ecclesiastical functions. They claim to administer the sacraments of baptism, penance, and extreme unction of the sick, and also

> to bury the dead in their own churchyards. Worse still, in order to bring us into disrepute and keep the faithful from our pious reunions, they have created two new confraternities, which are joined by men and women in such numbers that nowadays one can scarcely find a single Christian whose name does not appear in one or other register.[9]

Nevertheless the secular clergy were thereby forced into a more diligent exercise of their pastoral functions by the wholesome competition provided in the energetic and competent work of the friars.

The Dominicans were entrusted with the work of the papal inquisition which began under Gregory IX in 1232. Inquisitors were dispatched throughout the church summoning all who were suspected of heresy to appear before a jury of clergy and laity. Those who confessed were assigned a penance. Those who remained obstinate in the face of certain proof were excommunicated. In some instances they were handed over to the state for punishment, which in extreme cases could include confiscation of property, imprisonment, or even death. The notorious Spanish Inquisition bore a different stamp. This was primarily an instrument of the state and not of the church. On numerous occasions the Spanish authorities completely ignored papal pleas for clemency. Hundreds of orthodox bishops were killed by state officials, and the Jesuit order (founded 1540) was especially harassed because of its opposition to the Inquisition.

The friars enjoyed immediate popularity. In the second half of the 13th century the Franciscans had 25,000 religious and 1,100 houses. By 1303 the Dominicans numbered 10,000 friars and 600 priories. The new orders provided a necessary leaven for the interior life of the church.

FOURTEENTH CENTURY

The 14th century witnessed Europe in transition. The medieval ideal of unity as expressed in the Holy Roman Empire gave way to nationalism, and strong monarchs replaced the weak titular kings of the feudal age. Democratic theories were reflected in the emergence of representative institutions: parliament in England, the cortes in Spain, the estates-

general in France, although Germany was fragmented into more than 300 autonomous states. The revival of classicism with its emphasis on the individual paved the way for the principle of private judgment over secular and ecclesiastical authority. It was a time of trouble. The 100-years' war between France and England erupted in 1328 after years of preliminary sparring; the Black Death in 1348 carried off half of Europe's population; and scores of peasant revolts (one count lists 78) sparked by the tensions between declining feudalism and nascent capitalism contributed to the general unrest.

During most of this century (1309–1377) the papal residence was at Avignon in southern France, where the pontiffs practically became wards of the king. This "Babylonian Captivity," as it came to be called, resulted from the power struggle between King Philip IV of France and Pope Boniface VIII (see Ch. 4, p. 118). Clement V (1305–1314), the first of the Avignon popes, was forced by the king to condemn the Order of the Knights Templar, whereupon the king confiscated their assets. Clement was also plagued by the heresies of the Beghards and Beguines, who maintained that freedom in the Gospel meant freedom from all moral restraint.

As a result of emerging capitalism, princes, both secular and ecclesiastical, felt a great need for money to support their enterprises. The conflict between king and pope in France was sparked by the issue of taxation, and the war between France and England was primarily an economic affair. The Avignon popes, pressed as they were for capital, supported and strengthened some questionable financial institutions; the *annates*, in which the first year's income of a newly appointed bishop went to the pope (thus encouraging the frequent transfer of bishops); *reservations*, in which the revenues from vacant dioceses reverted to the pope so long as the vacancy existed; *expectancies*, in which, for a fee, a person was promised the right to succeed to an ecclesiastical office following the incumbent's death; *commendation*, by which, for a fee, a bishop was permitted to receive the revenues from a vacant diocese. Obviously this system was subject to gross abuse, and Petrarch (d. 1374) denounced the papacy in scathing terms:

> I am now living in France, in the Babylon of the West. . . . the poor fishermen of Galilee . . . have strangely forgotten their origin. I am astounded, as I recall their predecessors, to see these men loaded with gold and clad in purple, boasting of the spoils of princes and nations; to see luxurious palaces and heights crowned with fortifications. . . . We no longer find the simple nets which were once used to gain a frugal sustenance from the Lake of Galilee . . . . In short, we seem to be among the kings of the Persians or Parthians, before whom we must fall down and worship, and who cannot be approached except presents be offered.[10]

Churchly preoccupation with wealth also precipitated a crisis among the Franciscans. Already during the lifetime of St. Francis a dispute had arisen over the possession of wealth. A group calling themselves the Spiritual Franciscans insisted on a return to the austerity required by their rule. By the 14th century the struggle had become bitter, and in 1317 Pope John XXII condemned those who insisted on a return to "evangelical poverty" (these were also known as the Fratricelli) and burned four intransigents as heretics. Louis of Bavaria, however, was sympathetic to their cause and sheltered them in his territory. William of Occam became their literary champion. The Fratricelli were also suspect because the works of Joachim of Fiore were influential among them.

The Avignon popes by their claims to the loyalties (and revenues) of all Christians brought on a crisis of authority, since the monarchs of Europe were simultaneously making the same claims. A vigorous debate ensued as to the nature and origins of papal and regal authority. Perhaps the greatest of all the works on political theory written at this time was *On the Power of King and Pope* by the French Dominican, John of Paris. He argued that civil government had its origins in man's nature, while the priesthood was to guide man to the world to come. In both areas, civil and ecclesiastical, the rulers were responsible to the community, and the best government was one in which people participated through duly chosen representatives. Authority derived from the community:

> The lord pope as head and supreme member of the universal church is the general and universal administrator of all the goods of the churches . . . . He is not indeed the owner of them; rather the community of the universal church is the only lord and owner of all ecclesiastical goods in general . . . . It is clear that if a pope were to use the goods of the churches faithlessly and not for the common good, which he is bound to watch over as supreme bishop, he might be deposed provided that, after admonition, he would not mend his ways.[11]

Another famous writer of this time, Dante (d. 1321), wrote "On Monarchy," in which he advocated a universal monarchy and the papacy existing side by side, but the two spheres of equal authority were to be clearly delineated.

Marsiglio of Padua (d. 1342) wrote one of the most challenging works of the late Middle Ages in his *The Defender of Peace.* He declared that the state is supreme and that it derives its authority from the people; the church is a human institution and should come under state jurisdiction. Among other propositions he suggested that:

> 1. For the attainment of eternal beatitude it is necessary to believe in the truth of only the divine or canonic Scripture, together with its necessary consequences . . . .
> 2. Doubtful sentences of divine law . . . must be defined only by the general council of the believers . . . .
> 6. Only the whole body of citizens, or the weightier part thereof, is the human legislator.
> 9. An elective ruler, or any other official, is dependent only upon election by the body having the authority therefor, and needs no other confirmation . . . . [That is, papal confirmation of kings or emperors is unnecessary. Ed.]
> 18. The . . . bishops, collectively . . . can excommunicate the Roman bishop and exercise other authority over him, just as conversely.
> 32. Only the general council of all the faithful has the authority to designate a bishop or any metropolitan church highest of all, and to deprive or depose them from such position.[12]

Marsiglio further declared that Peter never possessed a primacy transferable to the popes and that all general councils

should include laymen as well as clergy. The *Defender* was condemned in 1327, and its excommunicated author spent the rest of his life in Munich under the protection of Louis of Bavaria.

The Franciscan, William of Occam (d. 1349), did not go so far as Marsiglio in placing the church under the state, yet in a series of antipapal tracts he advocated a separation of church and state which denied all temporal power to the papacy. He believed that popes could err and fall into heresy, and he distinguished between the whole church as genus with the Roman church as species. He also declared that a general council (which should include women) was the supreme authority in the church. In his defense of the Spiritual Franciscans, Occam denounced the policies of Benedict XII:

> Benedict XII . . . has forsaken the paths of both Christ and of Peter. For Peter, who was appointed pastor of the sheep by the prince of pastors, not only fed the sheep entrusted to him, but also in no way refused to lay down his life for them; this man, however, contrives to kill the sheep of Christ. Peter prescribed honor for the king; this man dishonors, blasphemes, vituperates, and confounds the king of kings. . . . Peter persecuted the unjust; this man does not cease to persecute the innocent and the just. Peter forsook wealth in the name of Christ and refrained from invading the rights of others; this man usurps the property and the rights of the greater and lesser under the pretense of Christ's name.[13]

He continued by asserting that "the empire does not depend on the pope, for the true empire has preceded him." Both Occam and Marsiglio exercised considerable influence on the conciliarists of the following century.

The English monarchs were especially suspicious of the papacy during its French captivity. The kings of England believed, not without reason, that the popes sided with the French in the 100-years' war and that many church revenues being sent to Avignon were actually being used in the war effort against England. Several statutes were passed by parliament forbidding English monies to be sent overseas and establishing a fine for appeals to non-English (i. e., papal)

courts. Some scholars detect the seeds of the English reformation in these attitudes, which antedate the disestablishment of Henry VIII by two centuries. Louis of Bavaria (d. 1347) provided a second center of opposition to the Avignon popes by offering shelter to the literary opponents of the papacy.

During these years of turmoil many efforts were made to return the papacy to Rome. Catherine of Siena (d. 1380) is especially famous for her letters to the popes, denouncing the style of life at Avignon and pleading for a return to Rome. Finally in 1377 Gregory XI (1370–1378) entered Rome, and the Babylonian Captivity was ended.

But a worse fate was in store for the church. When the pope died the next year, the cardinals, threatened by the Romans to elect an Italian, chose Urban VI, the autocratic and overbearing bishop of Bari. The French cardinals, who constituted a majority in the College of Cardinals, left Rome and met in the country away from the tumult. There they deposed Urban, insisting that the election had been held under duress, and they chose Clement VII, who promptly reestablished the papacy at Avignon. Since Urban refused to abdicate, the Western Church was now divided in its loyalties between two popes, thus inaugurating the Great Schism which lasted until 1417.

CONCILIARISM

It was this intolerable situation which called forth advocates of reform of the church "in head and members" by means of a general council. The conciliarists (those who saw the only solution to the impasse by calling a general council) drew heavily upon the ideas of John of Paris, Marsiglio, and Occam. The center of the movement was the University of Paris.

A year after the schism began, Conrad of Gelnhausen (d. 1390), a German master in Paris, began the movement by appealing to the French and German kings to convene a council. His fellow countryman, Henry of Langenstein (d. 1397) wrote "A Letter on Behalf of a Council of Peace" in which he rehearsed the rise of the papacy to prominence in the church, and he arrived at the conclusion:

> The power of appointing the pope resides primarily with the whole company of the bishops of the faithful. Thus, this power should revert to them whenever the cardinals are not able to elect, or do not wish to elect, or have all died, or are obviously abusing the power handed on to them . . . . Even if all the bishops had also died, would this power of appointing the pope remain with the remnant of the faithful? Indeed, it would . . . .[14]

In 1381 the University of Paris faculty unanimously adopted a resolution calling for a general council. Peter d'Ailly was a prominent leader of this school. His "Treatise on the Reformation of the Church" followed the thought of Occam. He believed that bishops and priests received their authority directly from Christ and not through the mediation of the pope and that both popes and councils were fallible. Jean Gerson followed d'Ailly as chancellor of the university, and though he supported conciliarism, he did not reject the primacy of the pope in the church. In his work *On Unity* he declared that the unity of the church was so important that nothing should hinder it. Popes may be deposed and even imprisoned, but the College of Cardinals was not to elect a pope unless he would be universally acknowledged. The papacy, he said, was permanent, but individual popes could be controlled by councils.

Some years after the schism had actually ended, Nicolas of Cusa (d. 1464), a German cardinal, wrote a famous work *On Catholic Concord* which outlined a program for the reform of the church. In his statements on the supremacy of the general councils he wrote:

> . . . ecclesiastical canons are rightly decreed by a common council; for the Church is a congregation. A single person cannot rightly issue ecclesiastical canons. Wherefore we see that in councils, canons issue from agreement, acceptance, consent, and approval; and that decretals or judicious decisions of the Roman pontiffs, or of contested incumbents in emergencies, have received the strength of stability and justness, not from a merely powerful will, but from the fact that in accordance with the canons it was right that those decisions should be made.[15]

In later years Nicolas modified his views somewhat, and he became a strong supporter of the papacy.

In 1409 the College of Cardinals finally succeeded in calling a general council in Pisa which deposed the popes at Rome and Avignon and elected Alexander V to succeed them. Neither of the deposed popes acknowledged the validity of the council, so there were now three popes claiming the allegiance of Christendom.

The schism was finally healed by the Council of Constance (1414–1418) which succeeded in deposing or ignoring all three pontiffs. Martin V was elected true pope (1417). A second issue of the council was the reform of the church. The newly elected pope was made to promise reforms in the areas of reservations, annates, expectancies, simony, and all other abuses which had come to be associated with the late medieval church. The council also condemned over 200 propositions of John Wycliffe and ordered his body to be exhumed from consecrated ground. The Bohemian priest, John Huss, after arriving under the promise of safety by the emperor, was declared a heretic and burned at the stake. Although the schism had been healed, the council's treatment of Wycliffe and Huss, together with its failure to effect genuine reforms, made the reformation of the 16th century inevitable.

WYCLIFFE AND HUSS

John Wycliffe (d. 1384), who had spent some years as a master at Oxford University and the last two decades of his life as a parish vicar, gained a reputation not only in philosophy but also in political affairs. Shortly after the outbreak of the papal schism he set forth ideas which were sharply critical of the papacy. He declared that the true church of Christ was that which reflected true Christian morality. Since the conduct of both popes, in his estimation, was in glaring contrast to this test, he pronounced them "limbs of Lucifer" in addition to labeling them antichrists. He attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation by observing that there can be no substance without observable accidents:

> I believe, as Christ and His apostles have taught us, that the sacrament of the altar, white and round, and like to other bread, is very God's body in form of bread. And therefore St. Paul names it never but when he calls it bread. And right as it is heresy to believe that Christ is a spirit and no body, so it is heresy to believe that this sacrament is God's body and no bread; for it is both together.[16]

He taught that the Bible alone was the source of all authority in the church and that it should be read by all the faithful. To this end he began to translate it into English. Membership in the true church, Christ's mystical body, was by divine predestination alone, a result of God's grace. Therefore pious works—veneration of saints, pilgrimages, indulgences—had no relation to salvation whatever. Wycliffe's followers, who came to be called Lollards, went preaching throughout England, attacking clerical celibacy, indulgences, and transubstantiation. Although Wycliffe himself escaped censure during his lifetime, the Lollards were severely persecuted.

Whereas Wycliffe's reform movement did not gain the support of most Englishmen, that of John Huss (d. 1415) in Bohemia became closely identified with Czech nationalism. Historians agree that Wycliffe's writings exerted considerable influence on the Bohemian church. Huss himself admitted in 1411 that he and his friends had been reading Wycliffe's books for over 20 years. Ties between the two countries were strengthened by the marriage of Richard II of England to Anne of Luxemburg, sister of the Bohemian king.

Early in his career at the University of Prague Huss stoutly maintained his orthodoxy on the doctrine of transubstantiation, the Mass, and indulgences. However, when Antipope John XXIII launched a campaign to raise money by means of indulgences, Huss became critical of the papacy and the church. With Wycliffe, he declared that the true church of Christ was not identical with the Roman church.

> There is one church of the sheep, another of the goats, one of the saints, another of the reprobates.
>
> Just as in the case of the body there are waste materials so also in the church there are those who are not of the Church.

> The tares stand together with the wheat. There are some who are in the Church in name and in fact as the predestined Catholics obedient to Christ, some neither in name nor in fact as the pagans, some only in name as the hypocrites, some in fact though not in name because condemned by the satraps of Antichrist.
>
> It remains to be considered whether the Roman church is the holy, apostolic Catholic church, the bride of Christ . . . . this church is not the holy, apostolic Church because the pope and the cardinals have often been stained by error and sin.[17]

He went on to say that popes have often contradicted each other, that clerics who lead ungodly lives are not worthy of support, and he demanded that the state take the initiative in effecting a moral reform.

In 1412 Huss was excommunicated, and he fled Prague. The emperor Sigismund prevailed upon him to appear before the Council of Constance to explain his views and be released from the ban. Huss, believing that he was innocent of heresy and that a general council would certainly exonerate him, agreed to the proposal and went to Constance. There he was promptly imprisoned even before his hearing. At his trial it was his affinities with Wycliffe that ultimately condemned him. He was burned at the stake, a common form of death for heretics since churchmen were forbidden by canon law to shed blood.

But Bohemia was not reconciled. Fifteen years of civil war ensued in which two parties emerged: the moderate Calixtines, who wished to remain in the Roman church but insisted on free preaching, Communion in both kinds, reform of morals, and reduction of the wealth of the clergy; and the extreme Taborites, who wanted to break away from Rome. Both parties united against the military arms of the Roman faction, and in 1434 peace was attained through compromise. Both Roman and Hussite Christians were permitted to exist side by side. The Moravian Brethren *(Unitas Fratrum)* are today in direct continuation of the followers of John Huss.

EPILOGUE

At the beginning of the 15th century the church was in trouble. In the East the Turks were overunning Asia Minor, and in 1453 Constantinople fell to the Moslems, in whose hands it remains to this day. In the West the forces of secularism were undermining an already discredited church. But the weakness of Christianity was more apparent than real. The voices for reform found a responsive echo in the multitudes of the faithful who shared their concern. As so often had happened in the past, reform finally did come, but it brought both bane and blessing. The church of the 20th century still lives in the shadow of the problems of authority, church and state, and the nature of dogma bequeathed to it by the late Middle Ages.

NOTES—CHAPTER 6

1. From the Decrees of the Synods of 742 and 743 published by Carloman, and from the Capitulary issued at the Reform Synod under Pepin, 755, *Era of Charlemagne*, ed. Stewart C. Easton and Helene Wieruszowski (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1961), pp. 159—160, 162.
2. Canons of the Council of Kiersey, *Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum*, vol. 14, cols. 920—921.
3. "Canon 3, Fourth Lateran Council," Colman J[ames] Barry, *Readings in Church History*, I (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960), 442.
4. "Canon 21, Fourth Lateran Council," ibid., p. 443.
5. *Exordium Parvum*, trans. P. E. Larkin, in *The White Monks*, ed. Louis Julius Lekai (Paris: Editions du Seiul, 1957), p. 265.
6. David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1963), p. 56.
7. Bernard Gui, "The Waldensian Heretics" in *The Portable Medieval Reader*, ed. James Bruce Ross and Mary Martin McLaughlin (New York: The Viking Press, c. 1949, 11th printing, 1960), pp. 202—206.
8. "St. Francis of Assisi: Second Rule of the Friars Minor Approved by Pope Honorius III, 29 November 1223," Barry, pp. 418—419.
9. In Daniel-Rops, *Cathedral and Crusade*, I (Garden City, N. Y.: Image Books, 1957), 204.
10. Petrarch, *On the Papal Court at Avignon*, in Barry, pp. 470—471.
11. John of Paris, *Tractatus de Potestate Regia et Papali*, in Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050—1300* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), pp. 206—207.
12. Marsiglio of Padua, *The Defender of Peace*, in Barry, pp. 487—489.
13. William of Occam, *Tract Against Pope Benedict XII*, in Barry, p. 496.

14. Henry of Langenstein, *A Letter on Behalf of a Council of Peace*, Ch. 14. In *Library of Christian Classics*, XIV, *Advocates of Reform* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953), 123.
15. From *De concordantia catholica*, Nicolas of Cusa, in *The Portable Medieval Reader*, p. 307.
16. Excerpts from Wycliffe, *The Medieval Church*, ed. Roland H[erbert] Bainton (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Anvil, 1962), pp. 164–165.
17. John Huss, *Tractatus de Ecclesia*, in Bainton, pp. 165–166.

APPENDIX

READINGS FROM PRIMARY SOURCES

NO. 1 – CONVERSION OF EUROPE

The Conversion of Clovis (Gaul)

The queen never ceased to entreat the king to recognize the true God and give up idols, but nothing could move him to believe these things until he was engaged in a war with the Alemanni in which he was compelled by constraint to confess what he had refused to do voluntarily. It came to pass that his army was in danger of being wiped out. Thereupon, lifting his eyes to heaven, with compunction of heart and moved to tears, he cried, "Jesus Christ, who art according to Clotilde the Son of the living God, who art said to give aid to those in trouble and victory to those who hope in Thee . . . I beseech Thee . . . if Thou wilt give me victory over mine enemies I will believe in Thee and be baptized in Thy name. I have called upon my gods and they are far removed from helping me. Hence I believe they are powerless, since they do not succour their followers. I now call upon Thee. Only save me from mine enemies." When he had thus spoken the Alemanni turned their backs and took flight . . . . Clovis returning related to the queen how he had won the victory by calling upon the name of Christ. Then the queen with haste secretly summoned Remigius, the bishop of Rheims, that he should instruct the king in the word of salvation. He then began privately to tell his majesty that he should believe in the true God, the maker of heaven and earth and should give up idols. The king said, "Willingly,

holy father, but there is one difficulty. My people will not give up their gods. But I will go and speak to them according to your word." But before he had opened his mouth all the people cried, "Pious king, we reject the mortal gods and are ready to follow the immortal god, whom Remigius preaches." Then the bishop with great joy gave orders to prepare the fount. The church was resplendent with banners, flickering candles and the scent of wax and incense, so that those present believed that they partook of the savor of heaven. The king asked that he be baptized by the pontiff. Like a new Constantine Clovis ascended to the laver, putting off his former leprosy. As he went down into the water the bishop said, "Bow thy neck. Adore what you have burned. Burn what you have adored." Now the holy bishop Remigius, a man of consummate learning and of great sanctity, may fitly be compared to the holy Sylvester [*who baptized Constantine*]. (Trans. from Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum. PL* 71, 225, xxx. Also in Roland H[erbert] Bainton, *The Medieval Church,* pp. 99–100.)

The Mission of Augustine to England

Having been strengthened, therefore, by the encouragement of the blessed father Gregory, Augustine, with the servants of Christ who were with him, returned to the work of the Word and came to Britain. At that time king Aedilberet [*Ethelbert*] in Kent was most powerful . . . . In this island, then, Augustine landed . . . having received, by the charge of the blessed Pope Gregory, interpreters from the nation of the Franks; and sending to Aedilberet, he gave orders to say that they had come from Rome, and brought the best message, which promised, without any doubt, to those who obeyed it, eternal joys in heaven, and a future kingdom without end with the living and true God. The king, on hearing these things, commanded them to remain in the island to which they had come, and that necessities should be afforded them, until he should see what to do respecting them. For before this the fame of the Christian religion had reached him, inasmuch as he had a Christian wife of the royal family of the Franks, by name Bereta [*Bertha*],

whom he had received from her parents upon this condition, that she might have leave to keep inviolate the rite of her faith and religion . . . . After some days, the king came to the island, and sitting in the open air, commanded Augustine with his companions to come there to conference with him. For being influenced by an ancient superstition, he had taken precaution that they should not come to him in any house, lest, on their arrival, if they had any knowledge of witchcraft, they might deceive him by taking some advantage of him. But they came endued not with demoniac but with divine virtue, bearing a silver cross for a standard, and the image of the Lord and Savior painted on a panel; and singing litanies . . . . When they preached to him the king replied, "Fair indeed are the words and the promises which you bring, but, because they are new and uncertain, I cannot give my assent to them, and leave those which for so long a time I have kept with all the nations of the Angles . . . . But we do not prohibit you from gaining by your preaching all whom ye are able to the faith of your religion." He gave them therefore an abode in the city of Doruvernis [*Canterbury*]. [Ethelbert received baptism 4 years later, together with 10,000 followers. Ed.] (Trans. from Bede, *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation* by Gidley. Also in Bainton, pp. 100–101.)

NO. 2 – MONASTICISM

Monasticism was a vital institution within the medieval church, and from the 6th century Benedict's Rule regulated the monastic way of life. Peter Damian's rather somber view of this life was shared by many, and William of Malmesbury describes the Cistercian Order at the height of its influence.

The Rule of St. Benedict

1. There are four kinds of monks. The first kind are the cenobites, those who live in monasteries and serve under a rule and an abbot. The second kind are the anchorites, (who) after long probation in a monastery go out from the community to the solitary combat of the desert. The third kind, a detestable kind, are the Sarabaites, (who) live in

. . . their own sheepfolds and not in the Lord's, whose law is the desire for self-gratification. The fourth kind are those called gyrovagues who spend their whole lives tramping from province to province, staying as guests in different monasteries for three or four days at a time. Of them it is better to be silent than to speak.

2. The abbot shall remember that he acts in the place of Christ, of whom Paul was speaking when he said, "We cry, Abba, Father." In dealing with the brethren he shall take account of circumstances, mingling encouragement with reproof, the severity of a master and the kindly affection of a father.

3. In matters of great import he shall gather the entire community, taking counsel with the brethren and listening even to the youngest, but let none obstinately defend his opinion.

5. The first degree of humility is obedience without delay. But this very obedience will be acceptable to God and pleasing to men only if what is commanded is done without hesitation, delay, lukewarmness, grumbling, or objection. For the obedience given to superiors is given to God.

6. Since the spirit of silence is so important, permission to speak should rarely be granted even to perfect disciples, for it is written, "In much speaking you will not escape sin." For speaking and teaching belong to the master; the disciple's part is to be silent and listen.

18. Monks are tepid who do not say through the entire Psalter and ordinary canticles every week. Monks shall sleep in a common dormitory, in separate beds, a candle always burning, with the young monks separated by the old.

21. If the community is numerous, they shall make choice of religious persons of good reputation and appoint them as deans.

24. An excommunicated brother is to be excluded from the table and choir.

27. The abbot, as a wise physician, shall send some of the older and wiser brethren to console the offender and provoke him to humility lest he be consumed by overmuch grief.

33. The vice of possessing property is particularly to be banished from the monastery. No one may presume to give or receive anything without the abbot's leave, or to possess anything whatever, not even book or tablets or pen.

39. A choice of two cooked dishes suffices at all times of the year. Fruit and vegetables may be added. A pound of bread for each day is enough, though the abbot may allow an increase to those engaged in hard labor. A pint of wine a day is sufficient, but if more be granted let it be sparingly. Except for the weak, no one shall eat meat at any time.

42. After Compline the brethren are to be silent while one reads. They are not to read the first seven books of the Bible or the book of Kings, because that part of Scripture is not profitable to weak understandings at that hour. After Compline no one shall be allowed to speak.

43. Nothing shall be put before the work of God (i. e. worship).

48. Idleness is the enemy of the soul. Therefore the brothers must spend a fixed part of their time in sacred reading and another fixed part in manual labor.

49. The whole life of a monk ought to be a continual Lent, but in Lent everyone must of his own accord add something above his usual practice.

60. If a priest asks to be received into the monastery, he shall be exempted in nothing, but know that he must keep the whole Rule. He must expect to be in the place which is his due according to the time when he entered the monastery.

64. The abbot is to be elected by the entire community. Let him study to be loved rather than feared. Let him not be distraught and anxious, not too exacting or obstinate, not too zealous or over-suspicious, for then he will never have peace. (*The Rule of St. Benedict,* Select Portions, *Western Asceticism,* trans. Owen Chadwick, *The Library of Christian Classics,* XII [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958], 291 to 337.)

The Monastic Ideal—Peter Damian (11th century)

For when we have renounced the world, we have constituted God as our property and consequently we have

become His property in such a way that He has become our portion and we are His peculiar heritage . . . . How, O monk, do you mean to lay Christ up in your cell? First, cast out money, for Christ and money do not go well together in one place . . . . Whoever . . . hastens to attain the height of perfection, let him confine himself within the walls of his cloister, let him love spiritual quiet, let him have a horror of running about in the world . . . . seize the arms of all the virtues—sobriety, humility, patience, obedience, chastity, charity—and fight not on behalf of fields or cities, not for children or wives, but for your souls . . . . Especially should you fast, so that your youth may acquire strength, and pray, for the reason that fasting subdues the vigour of the flesh and prayer raises the soul to God. . . . Be content with garments mean and few. Accustom yourself to wearing light and scant clothing. . . . poverty of clothing and scarcity of food drive out all avarice from the heart of a monk. *(The Portable Medieval Reader,* eds. James Bruce Ross and Mary Martin McLaughlin [New York: The Viking Press, 1960], pp. 49–55.)

The Cistercian Order—William of Malmesbury (early 12th century)

Certainly many of their regulations seem severe, and more particularly these: they wear nothing made with furs or linen, nor even that finely spun linen garment which we call Staminium; neither breeches, unless when sent on a journey, which at their return they wash and restore. They have two tunics with cowls, but no additional garment in winter, though . . . in summer they may lighten their garb. They sleep clad and girded, and never after matins return to their beds . . . . No one is ever absent from the daily services, or from complines, except the sick . . . . The abbat [sic] allows himself no indulgence beyond the others—everywhere present, everywhere attending to his flock; except that he does not eat with the rest, because his table is with the strangers and the poor . . . . From . . . September till Easter . . . they do not take more than one meal a day . . . . While they bestow care on the stranger and on the sick, they inflict intolerable mortifications on their own bodies for the

health of their souls. . . . the Cistercian monks at the present day are a model for all monks, a mirror for the diligent, a spur to the indolent. (From *Chronicle,* trans. J. A. Giles, in *The Portable Medieval Reader,* pp. 57–58.)

No. 3—THE PASTORAL OFFICE

For Pope Gregory's *Pastoral Rule* see Ch. 1, p. 14. See also Ch. 6, pp. 155 ff. The following selections record Charlemagne's edict on the ordination of the clergy and a description of a model parish priest of the early 12th century.

Charlemagne's Capitulary of 802

In the matter of choosing candidates for ordination, the emperor has confirmed this now to the bishops and abbots . . . a bishop or abbot shall not prefer the more worthless men in a monastery to the better ones; nor endeavor, on account of relationship, or through any flattery, to advance them over the better ones; nor bring such a one before us to be ordained when he has a better man whom he conceals and oppresses. We absolutely will not allow this, for it seems to be done out of derision and deceitfulness towards us. But let there be prepared for ordination men of such kind that, through them, gain and profit will accrue to us and to those who recommend them.

The secular clergy [i. e., priests] . . . ought to be educated in the episcopal palace or also in a monastery, with all diligence according to the discipline of the canons. They shall by no means be permitted to wander at large, but shall live altogether apart, not given to disgraceful gain, not fornicators, not thieves, not homicides . . . not quarrelsome . . . not proud, not drunken; but chaste in heart and body, humble, modest, sober, merciful, peaceful; that as sons of God they may be promoted to sacred orders . . . (In Colman Barry, *Readings in Church History* [Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1960], pp. 231–232.)

St. Gilbert of Sempringham—John Capgrave

He was in his youth and in his simplicity full gracious, like to Jacob, whom for his cleanness and innocence the

mother Rebecca, through the inspiration of God, preferred to be lord of all his brethren, as this man is preferred to be master of all this religion. He was . . . set to school and grounded in those sciences which they call liberal, as grammar, rhetoric, logic, and such others. But his heart at that time was more inclined to learn good manners than subtle conclusions. . . . Because afterward he was ordained to be a teacher of virtuous living, it was fitting that he should first be a disciple in the school of honesty. In all his youth he was clean from such vices as children have, like lying, wanton raging, and other stinking conditions. Even then he began to be like a religious man, to which life he was applied by God.

In that same secular life and at that tender age, he followed, as he could and might, the rules of religious life, and to those over whom he had any power he full benignly gave example to follow in the same rules. For first he was a master of learning to the little ones, such as learn to read, spell, and sing. The children who were under his discipline he taught not only their lessons in the book, but besides this he taught them to play in due time, and he taught that their play should be honest and merry without clamor or great noise. . . .

When he was promoted to the order of priesthood, and had souls in governance, and also had received power to make ministration of the spiritual gifts which by virtue of our Lord's blood are left in the church, then as a true steward of his Lord's treasure . . . the word of good exhortation was not hid in him, but he dealt it out freely to those who would learn. For his auditors were so endowed with learning that it seemed in all their governance they had been nourished in the monastery among the servants of God. They engaged in no insolent drinkings . . . nor . . . run to wrestlings, bear-baitings, and such other unthrifty occupations which men nowadays prefer before divine service . . . . Whoever had seen them within the church might soon discern whether they were Gilbert's parishioners or not, he had taught them so well to bow their backs and their knees to God and so devoutly to say their beads. (*Portable Medieval Reader,* pp. 73 to 75).

No. 4—FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL

Of all the medieval church councils, the Fourth Lateran in 1215 is probably the most significant, as many of its canons influenced the life of the church for centuries, and some continue to be normative today. See also Ch. 6, p. 148. The numbers refer to the canons of the council.

1. There is one Universal Church of the faithful, outside of which there is absolutely no salvation. In which there is the same priest and sacrifice, Jesus Christ, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine; the bread being changed *(transubstantiatio)* by divine power into the body, and the wine into the blood, so that to realize the mystery of unity we may receive of Him what He has received of us. And this sacrament no one can effect except the priest who has been duly ordained in accordance with the keys of the Church, which Jesus Christ Himself gave to the Apostles and their successors.

5. Renewing the ancient privileges of the patriarchal sees, we decree with the approval of the holy and ecumenical council that after the Roman Church, which by the will of God holds over all others preeminence of ordinary power as the mother and mistress of all the faithful, that of Constantinople shall hold first place, that of Alexandria second, that of Antioch third, and that of Jerusalem fourth.

13. . . . we strictly forbid anyone in the future to found a new order, but whoever should wish to enter an order, let him choose one already approved . . . he who should wish to found a new monastery must accept a rule already approved.

21. All the faithful of both sexes shall after they have reached the age of discretion faithfully confess all their sins at least once a year to their own (parish) priest and perform to the best of their ability the penance imposed, receiving reverently at least at Easter the sacrament of the Eucharist.

42. As desirous as we are that laymen do not usurp the rights of clerics [clergy], we are no less desirous that clerics abstain from arrogating to themselves the rights of laymen. Wherefore we forbid all clerics so to extend in the future their jurisdiction under the pretext of ecclesiastical liberty as to prove detrimental to secular justice.

62. From the fact that some expose for sale and exhibit promiscuously the relics of saints, great injury is sustained by the Christian religion. That this may not occur hereafter, we ordain . . . that in the future old relics may not be exhibited outside of a vessel or exposed for sale. And let no one presume to venerate publicly new ones unless they have been approved by the Roman pontiff. In the future prelates shall not permit those who come to their churches *causa venerationis* to be deceived by worthless fabrications or false documents as has been done in many places for the sake of gain.

68. . . . we decree that . . . (Jews and Saracens) in every Christian province and at all times be distinguished in public from other people by a difference of dress, since this was also enjoined on them by Moses. (Barry, *Readings in Church History,* pp. 439–446.)

No. 5 – SCHOLASTICISM

Anselm's Ontological Argument [Proof . . . of God's Existence]

Proposition – That the nonexistence of God is inconceivable.

Now the fool will admit that there can be in the mind something than which nothing greater can be conceived. This, being understood, is in the mind, but it cannot be only in the mind, because it is possible to think of something which exists also in reality and that would be greater. If, therefore, that than which nothing greater can be conceived is only in the mind, that than which a greater cannot be conceived is that than which a greater can be conceived, and this certainty cannot be [is self-contradictory]. Consequently, without doubt, that than which nothing greater can be conceived exists both in the mind and in reality. This, then, is so sure that one cannot think of its not being so. For it is possible to think of something which one cannot conceive not to exist which is greater than that which can be thought not to exist. Consequently, if that a greater than which cannot be conceived can be thought not to exist, it is not that a greater than which cannot be conceived. But this does not

make sense. Therefore it is true that something than which a greater cannot be conceived is not able to be conceived as not existing. This art Thou, O Lord, my God. (Monologium, *PL* 158, pp. 223–227. Trans. in Bainton, *The Medieval Church,* pp. 128–129.)

Abelard's Dialectical Method

Inasmuch as among the multitudinous words of the saints there are some which are not only diverse, but actually adverse the one to the other, we are not to judge lightly of these saints who themselves will judge the world. If there are divine mysteries which we cannot understand in the spirit in which they were written, better to reserve judgment than to define rashly. We are not to rely on apocryphal writings and we must be sure that we have the correct text of the canonical. For example, Matthew and John say that Jesus was crucified at the sixth hour, but Mark at the third. This is an error of transcription in Mark. We are to observe that sometimes an author is in error because he carelessly incorporated the work of someone else, as Augustine confessed he had done with reference to Origen. We must bear in mind the diversity of situation in which particular sayings were uttered. In case of controversy between the saints, which cannot be resolved by reason, we should hold to that opinion which has the most ancient and powerful authority. And if sometimes the fathers were in error we should attribute this not to duplicity but ignorance, and if sometimes they were absurd, we are to assume that the text is faulty, the interpreter in error or simply that we do not understand.

Therefore it has seemed to us fitting to collect from the holy fathers apparently contradictory passages that tender readers may be incited to make inquiry after the truth. . . . By doubting we come to inquire, and by inquiry we arrive at the truth. . . .

Example XXXII. That God may do all things and that He may not. Chrysostom said that God is called almighty because it is impossible to find anything that is impossible for Him. Nevertheless He cannot lie, or be deceived, He cannot be ignorant, He cannot have a beginning or an end.

He cannot forget the past, be involved in the present or be ignorant of the future. Finally, He cannot deny Himself. Augustine said there are some things God can do as to His power, but not as to His justice. Being himself justice He cannot commit injustice. He is omnipotent in the sense that He can do what He wants. But He cannot die, He cannot change and He cannot be deceived.

Example XI. That the divine persons differ from each other and that they do not.

Athanasius said there is one person of the Father, one of the Son and one of the Holy Spirit. The Father is not made, created or begotten. The Son comes solely from the Father. He is not made or created but is begotten. The Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. He is not begotten or created but proceeding. But Pope Leo I said, "In the divine Trinity nothing is dissimilar, nothing unequal." (*"Sic et non" PL* 178, pp. 1340–1350, 1393 and 1367. Also in Bainton, pp. 129–130.)

Thomas Aquinas on Faith and Reason

If the sole way of knowing God were through reason the human mind would remain in the deepest shadows of ignorance. The provision of divine providence was therefore wholesome that those truths which reason is able to investigate should none the less be held by faith.

Because men are ordained by divine providence for a higher good than human frailty can express in the present life, the mind is summoned to something higher than our reason here and now can reach. For then only do we know God truly when we believe Him to be above everything which man can conceive concerning Him.

Nevertheless, although the above mentioned truth of the Christian faith exceeds the capacity of human reason, still those conclusions which are naturally indited by reason cannot be contrary to this truth, for those propositions which are naturally instilled are so very true that it is not possible to think of them as false. Nor can we regard as false that which is manifestly communicated from on high.

The role of human reason with reference to knowing the

truth of the faith, which is fully clear only to those who behold the divine substance, is to collect certain similitudes resembling it. These do not suffice by way of demonstration or comprehension of this truth through themselves. Nevertheless, that the human mind should be exercised in such reasonings, however feeble, is useful, provided there be no presumptuous claims of comprehension or demonstration. (*Summa Contra Gentiles*, Book I, ch. 4–8. In Bainton, pp. 143 to 144.)

No. 6 – MYSTICISM

Walter Hilton (14th century English mystic)

There is one activity which is of great value and, as I think, a highway to contemplation. . . . It is for a man to enter into himself and come to the knowledge of his own soul and its powers, its beauty and its blemishes. . . . This is at first a difficult and painful spiritual labour for those who give themselves to it earnestly. For it is a striving in the soul against the root of all sins, great and small, and this root is nothing else than a false, misguided self-love. By this labour a man must withdraw his mind from the love of all earthly creatures, from vain thoughts, and images of all sensible things, and from all self-love. Then since it cannot find rest in the love and sight of Jesus Christ, it must needs suffer pain. . . .

This is a hard work, for useless thoughts will press on you to draw your mind down to them . . . you will find something, not Jesus whom you seek, . . . but an obscure and heavy image of your own soul.

Whoever thinks to come to the working and the full use of contemplation and not by this way, that is to say not by steadfast mind of the precious manhood and the passion of Jesus Christ nor by fulness of virtues, he cometh not by the door, and therefore as a thief he shall be cast out. . . . For Christ is door and He is porter . . . no man may come to the contemplation of the Godhead but he be first reformed by fulness of meekness and charity to the likeness of Jesus

in His manhood. *(The Scale of Perfection* I, 43:61-2; I, 92:137, in David Knowles, *The English Mystical Tradition* [New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961], pp. 106–107.)

Meister Eckhart (German Dominican, d. 1327)

The masters greatly laud love, as St. Paul said, "If I have not love I am nothing," but I would place detachment above love, because love causes me to love God whereas detachment causes God to love me. Others again rate humility above all virtues but I place detachment higher because there can be humility without detachment, but not detachment without humility. You may ask then what is detachment if it be so excellent. Know, then, that true detachment is nothing other than that the spirit should be immovable before all the vicissitudes of love and suffering, honor, disgrace and shame, like a mountain of lead against a breeze. This immoveable detachment brings men into the greatest likeness with God because the fact that God is God comes from his immoveable detachment. You may ask whether Christ had this detachment when He cried, "My soul is troubled even unto death," or Mary in her lamentation before the cross, but here we must distinguish between the inner and the outward man. . . .

The faster man flees from the creature the faster he is sought by the Creator. Detachment purifies the soul, purges the conscience, kindles the heart, awakens the spirit, extinguishes desires, makes God known, eliminates the creatures and effects union with God. Now understand, the swiftest steed to bring you to this perfection is suffering, for none experiences greater eternal sweetness than those who endure with Christ in greatest bitterness. The most solid foundation on which this perfection rests is humility. He who would attain perfect detachment must seek perfect humility by which he may come to the closest proximity to the Godhead. May He help us thereto, who is the highest detachment, that is God Himself. Amen. (Tract "On Detachment," ed. Eduard Schaefer [Bonn: 1956], pp. 214–217, in Bainton, pp. 173 to 174.)

Bernard of Clairvaux (12th century)

In addition you must also believe that through Him [Christ] your sins are forgiven. This is the testimony that the Holy Spirit has put into your heart when He says: "Your sins are forgiven you." For this is the meaning of the Apostle that man, without merit, is justified through faith. (Cited by E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times* [St. Louis: Concordia, 1950], p. 171.)

Therefore, where there is reconciliation, there is remission of sins. And what is that but justification? Whether therefore we call it reconciliation or remission of sins or justification, or again redemption, or liberation from the chains of the devil, by whom we were taken captive at his will, at all events by the death of the Only-begotten we obtain that we have been justified freely by His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace. (Bernard of Clairvaux, Ep. 190, *PL* 182, col. 1069.)

First of all, you must believe that you cannot have the forgiveness of sins except by God's indulgence; secondly, that you cannot have any good work at all unless He has given this, too; finally, that by no works can you merit eternal life, but that this is freely given as well. . . . Let nobody deceive himself; for if he considers carefully, he will undoubtedly discover that even with ten thousand soldiers he cannot stand up against the Lord who comes at him with twenty thousand. (Apology of the Augsburg Confession XXVII, 32.)

No. 7—CHURCH AND STATE

The first two selections reflect a theocratic attitude, the next one of lay supremacy, and John of Paris suggests a middle way between the two extremes.

Pope Gregory VII—Dictatus Papae (March 1075)

1. That the Roman Church was founded by God alone.
2. That the Roman Pontiff alone is rightly to be called universal.

3. That he alone can depose or reinstate bishops.

6. That . . . we ought also not to stay in the same house with those excommunicated by him.

7. That for him alone it is lawful to enact new laws according to the needs of the time, to assemble together new congregations, to divide a rich bishopric and unite poor ones.

8. That he alone may use the imperial insignia.

11. That his title is unique in the world.

12. That he may depose emperors.

16. That no synod may be called a general one without his order.

19. That he himself may be judged by no one.

22. That the Roman Church has never erred, nor ever, by the witness of Scripture, shall err to all eternity.

26. That he should not be considered as Catholic who is not in conformity with the Roman Church. (Sidney Z. Ehler and John B. Morrall, *Church and State Through the Centuries* [Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1954], pp. 43–44, in James A. Corbett, *The Papacy* [Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1956], pp. 103–104.)

The Incident at Canossa—Letter of Gregory VII to the German princes

Meanwhile we received certain information that the king was on the way to us. Before he entered Italy he sent us word that he would make satisfaction to God and St. Peter and offered to amend his way of life and to continue obedient to us, provided only that he should obtain from us absolution and the apostolic blessing. For a long time we delayed our reply and held long consultations, reproaching him bitterly through messengers back and forth for his outrageous conduct, until finally, of his own accord and without any show of hostility or defiance, he came with a few followers to the fortress of Canossa where we were staying. There, on three successive days, standing before the castle gate, laying aside all royal insignia, barefooted and in coarse attire, he ceased not with many tears to beseech the apostolic help and comfort until all who were present or who had heard the story were

so moved by pity and compassion that they pleaded his cause with prayers and tears. All marveled at our unwonted severity, and some even cried out that we were showing, not the seriousness of apostolic authority, but rather the cruelty of a savage tyrant.

At last, overcome by his persistent show of penitence and the urgency of all present, we released him from the bonds of anathema and received him into the grace of Holy Mother Church. (E. Emerton, *The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII* New York, 1932, pp. 111–112; in Tierney, p. 63.)

The "Anonymous of York" (c. A. D. 1100)

By divine authority and by institution of the holy fathers kings are ordained in the church of God and are consecrated at the altar with sacred unction and benediction, that they may have the power of ruling the people of the Lord, the Christian people, which is the holy church of God—a chosen race, a purchased people . . . . What else indeed is the church but the congregation of faithful Christians living together in the house of Christ in charity and in the one faith? Therefore kings receive in their consecration the power to rule this church, that they may rule it and strengthen it in judgement and justice and administer it in accordance with the discipline of the Christian law; for they reign in the church, which is the kingdom of God, and reign together with Christ, in order that they may rule, protect, and defend it. . . . Some seek to divide the principate in this fashion, saying that the priesthood has the principate of ruling souls, the king that of ruling bodies, as if souls could be ruled without bodies and bodies without souls, which cannot be done by any means. . . .

Christ, God and man, is the true and highest king and priest. But he is king from the eternity of his divinity, not made, not created, not below or separate from the Father, but equal to and one with the Father. He is priest from his assumption of humanity, made and created according to the order of Melchisedech and so less than the Father. . . . It is clear, therefore, that in Christ the royal power is greater and higher than the priestly in proportion as his divinity is greater

and higher than his humanity. Hence some hold that among men likewise the royal power is greater and higher than the priestly and the king greater and higher than the priest, as being an imitation and emulation of the better and higher nature or power of Christ. (In Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050–1300,* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964, pp. 76–77.)

John of Paris (Tractate on the Power of King and Pope 1302)

As regards the power of ecclesiastical pontiffs, the truth occupies a middle ground between two errors. The error of the Waldensians was to deny to the successors of the apostles, that is the pope and the prelates of the church, any rightful lordship over temporal things and to maintain that it is illicit for them to have any temporal riches. . . . The other error is that of Herod, who when he heard that Christ was born, believed him to be an earthly king. From this seems to be derived the opinion of certain moderns who . . . go so far as to assert that the lord pope . . . has dominion over the temporal goods of princes . . . .

Between such contrary opinions . . . I think that the truth establishes a middle ground . . . that it is not improper for the prelates of the church to have lordship and jurisdiction over temporalities . . . but . . . this is not owed to them by reason of their status . . . . but by concession or permission of princes if they have bestowed [them] out of devotion . . . .

The . . . pope . . . is not the owner of . . . [the goods of the churches]; rather the community of the universal church is the only lord and owner of all ecclesiastical goods . . . . It is clear that if a pope were to use the goods of the churches faithlessly and not for the common good, he might be deposed provided that, after admonition, he would not mend his ways.

[But] . . . the external goods of laymen are not conferred on the community like ecclesiastical goods but are acquired by individual persons through their own skill, labor, and industry; and individual persons, as individuals, have right and power over them and true lordship, and each one

can order, dispose, administer, retain, or alienate his own property at will without injuring anyone else, since he is the owner. (Tierney, pp. 206–207.)

Innocent III—On Endorsing Imperial Elections (1202)

We recognize that the authority and power to elect a king to be an emperor appertains to the princes as of ancient custom, the more valid because the Roman Church transferred the empire in the person of Charlemagne from the Greeks to the Germans. But the princes ought to recognize, as they do, that the authority and right of examining the person elected to be promoted to the empire belongs to us, who anoint, consecrate and crown. It is regularly and generally observed that the examination of a person pertains to the one who has the laying on of hands. Now, if the princes are not only in disaccord but even if they are in concord, conspiring together to elect a sacrilegious, excommunicated person, a tyrant, imbecile, heretic or pagan, shall we then anoint, consecrate or crown such a man? Absolutely not. (Bainton, *The Medieval Church,* p. 136.)

No. 8—ON SCRIPTURE

Medieval theologians were especially attracted to the allegorical interpretation of Scripture. The following two selections indicate the manner in which Biblical materials were often used.

Interpreting Scripture—Rabanus Maurus (d. 856)

Whoever desires to arrive at an understanding of Holy Scripture should consider when he should take the narrative historically, when allegorically, when anagogically, and when tropologically. For these four ways of understanding . . . we call the four daughters of wisdom, who cannot fully be searched out without a prior knowledge of these. Through them Mother Wisdom feeds her adopted children, giving to tender beginners drink in the milk of history; to those

advancing in faith, the food of allegory; to the strenuous and sweaty doers of good works, satiety in the savory refection of tropology; and finally, to those raised from the depths through contempt of the earthly and through heavenly desire progressing toward the summit, the sober intoxication of theoretical contemplation in the wine of anagogy. . . . History, through the ensample which it gives of perfect men, incites the reader to the imitation of holiness; allegory, in the revelation of faith, leads to a knowledge of truth; tropology, in the instruction of morals, to a love of virtue; anagogy, in the display of everlasting joys, to a desire of eternal felicity. In the house of our soul, history lays the foundation, allegory erects the walls, anagogy puts on the roof, while tropology provides ornament. (Henry Osborn Taylor, *The Medieval Mind* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951], Vol. II, 74.)

The Use of Allegory—Honorius of Autun (12th century)

By the two men who went up into the temple to pray, two peoples, the Jewish and the Gentile, are meant. The Pharisee who went close to the altar is the Jewish people, who possessed the Sanctuary and the Ark. He tells aloud his merits in the temple, because in the world he boasts of his observance of the law.

The Publican who stands afar off is the Gentile people, who were far off from the worship of God. He did not lift up his eyes to heaven, because the Gentile was agape at the things of earth. He beat his breast when he bewailed his error through penitence; and because he humbled himself in confession, God exalted him through pardon. Let us also, beloved, thus stand afar off, deeming ourselves unworthy of the holy sacraments and the companionship of the saints. Let us not lift up our eyes to heaven, but deem ourselves unworthy of it. Let us beat our breasts and punish our misdeeds with our tears. Let us fall prostrate before God . . . that He may turn our lament to joy . . . and clothe us with happiness. (Taylor, pp. 77–78.)

No. 9—THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

The Seven Sacraments—Pope Eugenius IV (1439)

In the Christian dispensation there are seven sacraments: baptism, confirmation, the Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, ordination and marriage which both contain grace and confer it upon those who receive it worthily. The first five refer to the spiritual perfection of each man in himself. The last two apply to the administration and expansion of the entire Church. By baptism we are spiritually reborn. By confirmation we are increased in grace and strengthened in faith. Being thus reborn and fortified we are nourished by the divine nutriment of the Eucharist. If through sin we fall into weakness of the soul we are cured spiritually by penance. Extreme unction is of benefit spiritually and corporally so far as is expedient for the soul. Through ordination the Church is truly governed and spiritually multiplied and through matrimony it is augmented in the flesh. These sacraments are affected in three ways, by things as to their material, by words as to their form and by the person of the one officiating as to the intention to do what the Church does. If any one of these is lacking the sacrament is not complete. Among these sacraments there are three, baptism, confirmation and ordination, which imprint upon the soul an indelible character. Therefore they are not to be repeated on the same person. The other four do not confer an indelible character and may be repeated.

The first place among the sacraments is held by baptism. The matter of the sacrament is true and natural water, whether hot or cold. The form is, "I baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The minister of this sacrament is a priest, but in case of necessity the rite may be performed by a deacon, layman, a woman or even a pagan or a heretic, provided he uses the form of the Church and intends to do what the Church does. The effect of this sacrament is the remission of original sin and actual sin and the removal of all penalty so that no satisfaction is to be enjoined for sins committed prior to baptism. Those who die before having committed any sin go straight to

heaven and enjoy the vision of God. The second sacrament is confirmation. The matter is chrism of oil, signifying excellence of conscience, and balsam blessed by the bishop, signifying the odor of good reputation. The form is, "I sign you with the sign of the cross and confirm you with the chrism of salvation in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." This sacrament is to be administered only by a bishop. Its effect is to confer the Holy Spirit.

The third is the sacrament of the Eucharist, whose sign is wheaten bread and wine from the vine with which before consecration a little water may be mixed. The form of the sacrament is the words of the Savior at the institution. The priest in the person of Christ speaking administers the sacrament. By virtue of the words themselves the substance of the bread is converted into the body of Christ and the substance of the wine into the blood, but in such fashion that the whole of Christ is present in each element. The effect is that whatever food and drink can do for the body by way of sustenance, increase, restoration and delight, this the sacrament does for the spiritual life. The fourth sacrament is penance whose material part is the act of penitence in three components. The first is contrition of the heart, the second confession of the mouth by which all sins remembered are to be confessed to the priest completely. The third is satisfaction for sins according to the judgment of the priest particularly through prayer, fasting and alms. The form of this sacrament is in the words of absolution *Ego te absolvo.* The minister is the priest. The effect is absolution from sins.

The fifth is extreme unction whose matter is olive oil blessed by the bishop. This sacrament is to be given only to those whose death appears imminent. The anointing is to be applied to the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hands, feet and reins. The form is: "By this holy anointing and by His most holy mercy may God grant unto you that . . . ." The minister is the priest. The effect is the healing of the mind and if it be expedient of the body.

The sixth is ordination. The material in the case of the priest (not of deacons) is the offering of a chalice of wine and a paten of bread. The form for a priest is: "Accept the power to offer sacrifice in the Church for the living and the dead

in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The bishop officiates. The effect is an increase in grace to become a worthy minister.

The seventh is matrimony. The efficient cause is consent expressed by words in person. There are three goods of marriage. The first is the bearing and rearing of children in the worship of God. The second is faith by which each partner should serve the other. The third is indissolubility after the manner of the indissoluble union of Christ and the Church. There may be separation because of fornication but the marriage is not dissolved. (Bainton, *The Medieval Church,* 144–146.)

On Building a Church—Abbot Suger's account of "The Consecration of the Church of St. Denis" (1144)

Our former church was constructed with royal munificence by the glorious and famous king of the Franks, Dagobert, who in response to a vision of the saints, erected in their honor a basilica of marble adorned with jewels of incomparable splendor. In time this edifice became too small to accommodate the throngs who came to kiss the holy relics of the Lord, the nail and the crown of thorns. Such was the press that men were as immobile as statues, women took on the pallor of death and cried out as in travail and others, lifted by the men, crawled over them as on a pavement.

I knew not where to find marble for the new church and thought of bringing columns from the baths of Diocletian at Rome through the Mediterranean under convoy even of the Saracens, then by the English Sea and the tortuous Seine, when the Almighty revealed to us a quarry nearby at Pontoise. The columns were hauled by common folk and noble who alike harnassed themselves as beasts of burden. Similarly I knew not where to find adequate timber and supposed that it would be necessary to go to remote Auxerre. I resolved, however, to search the forest of Iveline, though told that it had already been stripped of larger timbers for fortifications. I penetrated the thickets and found twelve trees which the Lord Jesus had protected from the plunderers and reserved for Himself and the Holy Martyrs.

The plan was to build a new church and to integrate the old with the new, except for the gracious and laudable extension of a cluster of chapels by which the entire sanctuary should be suffused with a marvelous and perpetual light from the most holy windows, adding lustre to the beauty within.

Summer and winter for three years we labored and when the church was done we resolved to build a new reliquiary for the remains of our patron saints and in front of this to construct an altar, to which peers, princes and bishops sent precious stones and the illustrious king himself presented exquisite emeralds. The consecration was set for the second Sunday in June and was attended by our Lord King Louis, Queen Eleanor, the Queen Mother and divers peers, archbishops and bishops from France and the Archbishop of Canterbury. When the king and the nobility beheld the chorus of such pontiffs in white vestments with mitres, bejeweled orphreys and croziers, processing to celebrate the nuptials of the Eternal Spouse, to them it appeared that this was rather a heavenly than an earthly chorus, a ceremony less human than divine. . . . After the consecration of the main altar and of twenty others, a solemn mass was celebrated whose melody, ravishing in consonance and congruent harmony, seemed rather a heavenly than an earthly symphony, and all with one heart and voice acclaimed, "Blessing, honor, and glory be unto Thy name, Lord Jesus Christ." (Selected from Erwin Panofsky, *Abbot Suger* [Princeton, 1946], pp. 93–103, in Bainton, *The Medieval Church,* pp. 134–135.)

Hymn for Good Friday—Peter Abelard (12th century)

Alone to sacrifice Thou goest, Lord,
Giving Thyself to death whom Thou hast slain.
For us Thy wretched folk is any word,
Who know that for our sins this is Thy pain?

For they are ours, O Lord, our deeds, our deeds,
Why must Thou suffer torture for our sin?
Let our hearts suffer for Thy passion, Lord,
That sheer compassion may Thy mercy win.

This is that night of tears, the three days' space,
Sorrow abiding of the eventide,
Until the day break with the risen Christ,
And hearts that sorrowed shall be satisfied.

So may our hearts have pity on Thee, Lord,
That they may sharers of Thy glory be:
Heavy with weeping may the three days pass,
To win the laughter of Thine Easter Day.

(Trans. Helen Waddell, *Medieval Latin Lyrics* [New York: Holt, 1938], cited in *The Portable Medieval Reader*, ed. James Bruce Ross and Mary Martin McLaughlin [New York: The Viking Press, 1960], p. 500.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING

General histories of the church which contain good sections on the Middle Ages are Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, revised (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1959); Martin E. Marty, *A Short History of Christianity* (A Living Age Book, paperback, published by Meridian, 1959); and Roland H. Bainton, *Christendom* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964). Three popular hard-cover treatments of the medieval church are Margaret Deanesly, *A History of the Medieval Church* (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., repr. and rev. 1962); W. R. Cannon, *History of Christianity in the Middle Ages* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1960); and G. M. S. Walker, *The Growing Storm* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961). Two shorter paperbacks for use in college classrooms are Roland Bainton, *The Medieval Church* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Anvil, 1962), half of which is primary source readings, and Marshall Baldwin, *The Medieval Church* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1960).

There are many readily available paperback treatments of special areas in medieval Christianity. For feudalism two standard works are F. L. Ganshof, *Feudalism* (New York: Harpe & Row, 1961), and Carl Stephenson, *Medieval Feudalism* (Ithaca, N. Y. Cornell University Press, 1960). Much material on Byzantium has become available in recent years, including J. M. Hussey, *The Byzantine World* (New York: Harper & Row, 1961), D. A. Miller, *The Byzantine Tradition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), and Steven Runciman, *Byzantine Civilization* (New York: Meridian Books, 1959).

Two very fine studies in medieval theology and thought

are by David Knowles, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1963) and Gordon Leff, *Medieval Thought from Augustine to Ockham* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965).

Perhaps the best treatment available on church-state relations is that by Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050–1300* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964), which is primarily a source book of readings with introductions and commentary.

On the papacy, a good descriptive analysis together with numerous plates and illustrations is that by Geoffrey Barraclough, *The Medieval Papacy* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968). Herbert B. Workman, *The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1962), although first published in 1918, remains a standard text for monastic history.

Evelyn Underhill's *Mysticism* (New York: Meridian Books, 1965) remains the standard in this field.

Collections of primary sources which are useful include Colman Barry, *Readings in Church History* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1960); Henry Bettenson, Ed. *Documents of the Christian Church*, 2d. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963); and J. B. Ross and M. M. McLaughlin, *The Portable Medieval Reader* (New York: Viking Press, c. 1949, 11th printing, 1960). Charles Anderson, *Augsburg Historical Atlas of Christianity in the Middle Ages and Reformation* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Pub. House, 1967) contains 32 maps together with concise commentary.

The *Problems in European Civilization* series of D. C. Heath and Co. of Boston contains several volumes pertinent to the medieval church, including *The Coronation of Charlemagne: What Did It Signify?* (1959); *The Holy Roman Empire in the Middle Ages* (1965); *The Gregorian Epoch: Reformation, Revolution, Reaction?* (1964); *Innocent III: Vicar of Christ or Lord of the World?* (1963); *The Crusades: Motives and Achievements* (1964).

Every book here mentioned, with the exception of the general histories, the atlas, and Bettenson, are available in inexpensive paperback editions.

Abelard, 76-77, 179-180, 192-193
Adoptionism, 70-71
Aiden, 18
Albigensians, 153-154
Alcuin, 6, 23, 27, 35, 70, 71, 99
Alexander III (pope), 112-113
Anglo-Saxon missions, 23-26
Anselm, 75-76, 108, 178-179
Ansgar, 28, 37
Aquinas, Thomas, 80-82, 117, 180-181
Arianism, 70, 77
Aristotle, 117
Armenia, church of, 125
Athanasius, 56
Augustine of Canterbury, 6, 15, 16, 17, 106, 151, 170-171
Augustine of Hippo, 27, 48, 65-67, 86, 128, 147
Avignon, popes at, 158-162; *see also* Papacy, Babylonian Captivity

Basil II (Eastern emperor), 127
Becket, Thomas à, 87, 108-109
Bede (Venerable), 15, 17, 170-171
Benedict of Nursia, 56-57, 58, 59
  Rule of, 171-173
Bernard of Clairvaux, 78, 142, 183
Bishop, office of, 46-48
Boethius, 67-68, 74, 107
Boniface, "Apostle of Germany," 6, 24, 25, 29, 36, 37
Boniface VIII (pope), 118-119, 158
Byzantium (Byzantine, Eastern Orthodox) 14, 43, 71, 98, 122-133
  Controversies with West, 133-139

Caesarius of Arles, 65
Canon law, 42, 49, 52, 54-55; *see also* Law
Canons, 46, 47, 48, 49
Cardinals, 45
Carolingians, 70-74, 97-101, 110
Cassian, John, 65
Cassiodorus, 68-69
Celtic missions, 19-20
Charlemagne, 26, 27, 29, 40, 43, 71, 89, 97-98, 99, 100, 123, 135, 147, 175
Charles Martel, 25, 40
Chivalry, 63
Church year, 60-61
Cistercian Order, 59, 150-151, 174-175
Clovis, 12, 20, 21, 97, 169-170
Cluny, 59, 150
Columba of Iona, 20
Columban, 21-23
Communion (Eucharist), 70, 72-73, 88, 89, 149; *see also* Sacraments
  Eastern Orthodox, 130
  Reform of, 165-166
Conciliarism, 162-164; *see also* Councils
Conrad of Gelnhausen, 162
Constantine, 92
  Donation of, 94-95
Coptic Church, 125
Councils of the church, 55-56, 131, 146-149, 162, 164
  Aachen (816), 42
  Chalcedon (451), 124, 133
  Clermont (1095), 139
  Constance (1414-18), 164
  Constantinople (381), 133
  Constantinople (553), 124
  Constantinople (681), 125
  Florence (1438), 138
  Kiersey (853), 147
  1st Lateran (1123), 147
  2nd Lateran (1139), 148
  3rd Lateran (1179), 148
  4th Lateran (1215), 55-56, 73, 148, 153, 154, 177-178
  Lyons (1245), 117
  Mainz (848), 72
  Nicea (787), 135
  Orange (529), 66, 146
  Pavia (1159), 112
  Pisa (1409), 164
  Winchester (970), 151
Courts, ecclesiastical, 53, 54
Crusades, 86, 139-144
Cyril of Thessalonica, 29-30, 36

Damian, Peter, 103, 173-174

Dante, 160
Dominic of Guzman (Dominicans), 154, 155, 156-157
Duns Scotus, 82

Eckhart, John, 84, 182
Erigena, John Scotus, 73
Ethelbert of Kent, 16
Exarch of Ravenna, 13, 14
Excommunication, 46

Feudalism, 39-43
Filioque, 71-72, 137, 138
Finance, ecclesiastical, 50-52
Francis of Assisi (Franciscans), 60, 155-156
  Spiritual Franciscans, 154, 159
Franks, 12, 97, 135
Frederick I, "Barbarossa" (emperor), 111-113, 143
Frederick II (emperor), 115-118, 144
Friars, 154-157; *see also* Dominicans, Franciscans

Gelasius I (pope), 93-94
Gerson, Jean, 163
Gilbert of Sempringham, 175-176
Gothic architecture, 80, 191-192
Gottschalk, 72
Great Britain, conversion of, 15-20
Gregory I (pope), 6, 13-16, 37, 43, 69, 94, 107
Gregory VII "Hildebrand" (pope), 103-105, 107, 139, 183-185
Gregory IX (pope), 116, 157
Gregory of Tours, 21, 170

Henry II (king of England), 108-109
Henry IV (emperor), 102-103, 104, 105, 139
Henry V (emperor), 106
Henry of Ghent, 83
Henry of Langenstein, 162-163
Heraclius (Eastern emperor), 126, 133
Hilton, Walter, 181-182
Hohenstaufen dynasty, 111-114
Huss, John, 164-166
Hymns, 90

Iconoclastic controversy, 71, 134-135
Innocent III (pope), 43, 114-115, 143, 153, 155, 187
Inquisition, 157
Interdict, 45
Investiture controversy, 5, 101-106
Isidore of Seville, 69, 94, 95
Islam, 31-34; *see also* Crusades

Jesuits (Society of Jesus), 157
Joachin of Fiore, 154, 159
John of Damascus, 132, 134-135
John of Paris, 159-160, 186-187
Justinian I (Eastern emperor), 122-124, 126

Knights Hospitaller, 142
Knights Templar, 142, 158

Law
  Canon, 42, 49, 52, 54-55
  German, 5
  Roman, 5, 105-106, 111-112, 124
Leo III (Eastern emperor) 126, 128, 134; *see also* Iconoclastic controversy
Liturgy, 89; *see also* Communion
  Eastern Orthodox, 130-131
Lollards, 165
Lombard, Peter, 77
Lombards, 12, 14, 99, 123, 135
Louis the Pious, 35, 36, 100
Louis IX (king of France), 110-111, 144
Luxeuil, 22
Magna Charta, 109
Manegold of Lautenbach, 105
Marsiglio of Padua, 160-161
Melkites, 125
Methodius of Thessalonica, 29-30, 36
Mission methods, 34-37
Missions
  to Bohemia, 29-30; to Bulgaria, 30; to Europe, 20-26; to Great Britain, 15-20; to Moravia, 29-30; to Russia, 31; to Saxony, 26-27; to Scandinavia, 27-29
Monasticism
  Western, 56-60, 171-175
  Eastern, 129-130
Monophysites, 124, 134
Mysticism, 84-85, 181-183

Neoplatonism, 66, 67
Nestorius, 124-126
Nicholas I (pope), 101, 136-137
Nicholas II (pope), 44
Nicolas of Cusa, 163, 164
Normans (Norsemen), 100-101

Orders, religious, 149-151, 154-157; *see also* Cistercian, Cluny, Dominic, Francis
  Holy, 88
Otto I (emperor), 102

Papacy, 43-46
  Babylonian Captivity 119, 158-162
  Bull, 45
Parish, 6, 48-50
Paschasius Radbertus, 72
Pastoral office, 48-49, 175-176
Patriarch (Eastern Orthodox), 129
Patrick of Armagh, 19
Paulinus, 18
Peace of God, 62
Pepin the Short, 26, 97, 135
  Donation of, 97, 99
Peter d'Ailly, 163
Phillip IV (king of France), 118-119, 158
Photius (Photian schism), 136-137
Preaching, 89-90
Predestination, 72
Pseudo-Dionysius, 70, 73

Ratramus, 73
Relics, 86-87
Richard I (king of England), 109, 143
Rome, "fall" of, 14, 122
Russia, conversion of, 31, 127

Sacraments, 87-88, 189-191; *see also* Communion
Saints, 85-86, 87
Saladin, 143
Saxony, conversion of, 26-27, 35
Scandanavia, conversion of, 27-29
Schism
  Eastern (1054), 137-138; Western (1378), 162; Photian (863), 136-137
Scholasticism, 74-79, 178-181
Scripture
  Attitudes toward, 83-84, 85, 187-188; Wycliffe on, 165; Rabanus Maurus on, 187-88; Honorius of Autun on, 188
Seljuk Turks, 127-128
Spain, 31-34

Tauler, John, 84
Teutonic Knights, 142
Truce of God, 63

Universals, 76
Universities, 79-80
Urban II (pope), 139

Vandals, 12, 122
Vassalage, 39, 40
Verdun, treaty of, 100
Visigoths, 12
Visitation, canonical, 47, 149

Waldensians, 152-153
Wilfrid of Ripon, 18
William I (king of England), 41, 107, 108
William of Occam, 82-83, 161
Willibrord, 23, 24, 35, 37
Wycliffe, John, 164-165

NORWAY
SWEDEN
RUSSIAN STATES
SCOTLAND
Iona
IRELAND
Armagh
York
ENGLAND
London
Lund
TEUTONIC KNIGHTS
LITHUANIA
GOLDEN HORDE
HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE
Fulda
POLAND
Paris
FRANCE
Cîteaux
Cluny
Evora
AQUITAINE
Constance
Venice
HUNGARY
Black Sea
Avignon
NAVARRE
PAPAL STATES
ALBANIAN PRINCES
Constantinople
BULGARIA
OTTOMAN TURKS
SELJUK TURKS
PORTUGAL
CASTILE
ARAGON
KINGDOM OF NAPLES
Rome
Naples
Cordova
Seville
GRANADA
Granada
SICILY
Damascus
Jerusalem
Alexandria

Europe 1360

DATE DUE

DEC 3 1 1976

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BW1400 .V94
The church of the Middle Ages; growth
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00152 2301